WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 02878 7406

# THE

# CHURCH OF IRELAND:

## A Historical Sketch.

BY THE

REV. HENRY SEDDALL, LL.D.,

*Rector of Vastina, Diocese of Meath;*

AUTHOR OF "EDWARD NANGLE, THE APOSTLE OF ACHILL," "THE MISSIONARY HISTORY OF SIERRA LEONE," "MALTA, PAST AND PRESENT," ETC.

---

"It is not by resigning ancient rights that we can hope to carry our Church in safety through the dark future that looms before us, but by adhering to our Church as she came down to us, so far as possible, by upholding her truth and maintaining her Apostolic character."—*The Lord Primate to the Armagh Diocesan Synod*, 1885.

---

2033
WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY

*DUBLIN:*

HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO., GRAFTON STREET,

Publishers to the University.

*LONDON:*

HATCHARD & CO., PICCADILLY.

1886.

45207955 ✓

BT
3410
S14

# PREFACE.

I HAVE endeavoured to give, in the following pages, a concise and, at the same time, an accurate account of the changes through which the Church of Ireland has passed during the last fourteen hundred years. The subject upon which I have ventured to write has occupied my attention for several years past; and I have laid under tribute every scrap of information which I thought could throw some light upon it.

There are, no doubt, many very valuable books in existence which deal with Irish Church History; but it will be found that these books have been written for scholars, and are not easily accessible to general readers. They are, besides, limited in their range;

each author confining himself to one portion, sometimes indeed, a very small portion, of the Ecclesiastical History of this country.

A book which could be easily procured, and which, within a small compass, should contain the information eagerly sought after by many Churchmen, appeared to be required; and I have taken upon myself to try and supply the want.

I have aimed at producing a "Sketch"—nothing more. To discuss the history of the Church of Ireland in detail would require the genius and learning of Macaulay or Alison; but, in its proper place, even a Sketch may be of some use.

Bishop Mant's interesting volumes were published nearly half a century ago; and since then many events of immense importance have occurred. These events have been included in the following narrative. For six years (1875—1881) I wrote every week, as special correspondent of a Church of England Weekly Newspaper,* a letter which contained a summary of

* *The Rock.*

"Irish Church Intelligence." Some of the information contained in these letters I have reproduced and woven into the concluding chapters of this book. I have also given in an Appendix a correct list of the Bishops of the Church of Ireland for a period of 350 years, from 1535 to 1885. The Episcopal succession for the whole period, from the time of St. Patrick to the Reformation was, undoubtedly, unbroken; but it is not easy to obtain a correct list of the names of the Bishops for that period.

I hope that what I have written may be read in England as well as in Ireland, and may prove useful as establishing the historical continuity of the Church of Ireland.

If it be allowable for me to say anything more by way of apology for having produced the following "Historical Sketch," let me do so in the words of Bishop Mant. He says:—"An acquaintance with the history of the Reformed Church of Ireland is necessary for completing an acquaintance with the history

of the British Empire in general, as well as with that of Ireland in particular. It is also necessary for completing an acquaintance with the history of that National Church of which the Irish Church forms an integral member—the United Church of England and Ireland. But an acquaintance with the history of the Reformed Church of Ireland is not really attainable; for while England and Scotland each possesses its ecclesiastical histories, Ireland is destitute of similar channels of intelligence. Those, indeed, who are solicitous on the subject, and have the various sources of information at hand, may search it out where it lies overwhelmed, as a secondary topic, among the records of the general history of the country, or imperfectly blended with the biographies of eminent political or ecclesiastical characters, or mixed up with heaps of miscellaneous documents. But it is not easy thus to procure a copious, detailed, entire, and continuous view; and in all likelihood the consequence is, that the history of the Reformed

Irish Church is known with any considerable accuracy and fulness by a few only; and by the many is hardly known at all."

It will be a source of boundless satisfaction to me if the result of this feeble effort of mine be, to make the leading facts of the history of the Church of Ireland known to many, "especially unto them who are of the household of faith."

H. S.

Vastina Rectory,
Castletown,
Mullingar.
*November*, 1885.

# CONTENTS.


| CHAP. | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | PREFACE | v |
| I. | EARLY HISTORY | 1 |
| II. | INVASION | 21 |
| III. | REFORMATION | 47 |
| IV. | HOSTILE CAMPS | 76 |
| V. | CHURCH AND STATE | 107 |
| VI. | UNION WITH ENGLAND | 136 |
| VII. | THE COMING STRUGGLE | 164 |
| VIII. | DISESTABLISHMENT | 196 |
| IX. | RECONSTRUCTION | 231 |
| X. | PROGRESS | 268 |
| XI. | MODERN HISTORY | 301 |
| XII. | CHURCH WORK | 335 |
| | APPENDIX: BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND FROM 1535 TO 1885 | 377 |

# THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

## CHAPTER I.

### EARLY HISTORY.

"NATURE," says Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, "has implanted in our breasts a lively impulse to extend the narrow span of our existence by the knowledge of events that have happened on the soil which we inhabit, and of the characters and actions of those men from whom our descent, as individuals or as a people, is derived."

I venture to think that there are very few Irish Churchmen who do not take an interest in the ecclesiastical, as well as in the secular, events of bygone days, and who do not estimate at their true value the "characters and actions" of the men of old, to whose steadfastness and fidelity Ireland is so deeply indebted at the present moment.

The history of the Church of Ireland deserves the special attention even of those who are not in communion with her. Her career has been so eventful, so romantic, so full of adventure, that she occupies

quite a unique position among the Churches of Christendom.

During a period of fourteen centuries she has passed through innumerable changes and vicissitudes. Sometimes the sun of prosperity has shone brilliantly upon her; and at other times the lowering clouds of adversity have gathered over her: but whether in prosperity or in adversity, she has always been, as a Church, true to her great mission. She has preserved, through evil report and through good report, the grand truths of the Christian religion in Ireland. Overborne for a time by the almost irresistible influence of the Church of Rome, she nevertheless rose, when opportunity offered, superior to that influence. Used as a tool sometimes for the furtherance of political ends by those who stood at the helm of the State, she always in the end successfully asserted her independence, and proclaimed to the world that her mission is a Divine, not a secular, mission. She now stands before the Christian world purified by the fire of trial through which it has been her lot to pass, determined to maintain at all hazards "the faith once delivered to the saints," resolved to stand forth as the defender of Holy Scripture against the assaults of the Infidel and against the corruptions of the Vatican; ready to perish, and to be blotted out of existence, rather than surrender even the weakest of the outposts in the citadel of Truth.

If there be now any regard for religion and morality in Ireland, if there be any loyalty towards the

legitimate sovereign of the Realm, any desire to obey the law, and those whose duty it is to enforce obedience to the law; I say unhesitatingly that the credit is due mainly to the influence and action of the Church of Ireland.

Let it be carefully observed that I say mainly, not exclusively. I willingly and gratefully acknowledge that all Protestants in Ireland are on the side of true religion, of law and order; but the ancient Church of this country, having long been an Established Church, and, as such, bound up with the very existence of the nation, possesses still an amount of influence over the loyal portion of the population which other bodies of Protestant Christians never have possessed, and never can hope to obtain.

As for that branch of the Church of Rome which has obtained a footing in Ireland, I do not scruple to say that she has always been the open and undisguised enemy of the Bible, and also, that she has often been the secret abettor of plots against the British Government. When I say the Church of Rome, I mean exactly what I say, and nothing more. I speak of the Church as a corporate body. For it would be both unfair and untrue to deny that within the communion of that Church are to be found large numbers of individual members who are as loyal to the Queen, as obedient to the laws of the land, and as pure and upright in their lives, as the very best of Protestants.

In dealing with the subject which I have proposed

to discuss, I shall endeavour to be as fair, as impartial, and as exact as possible. I write only to serve the cause of pure and Scriptural Christianity, and to convey to those who shall read what I am about to write accurate information concerning that Church of which it is my happiness to be a Presbyter, and that it were in my power to do her full and complete justice before the world, my highest ambition.

Let us look back into the dim and shadowy past. We shall find, if we do so, that there is light enough to guide us in our historical researches.

When we study the ancient history of Ireland, this conclusion forces itself irresistibly on our minds; that the Irish people, even during the centuries which immediately preceded the Christian æra, were not untutored savages. They lived under a monarchical government. They had equitable laws, which were, on the whole, wisely administered. They cultivated the arts of civilised life. Wars amongst rival clans were, it is true, frequent, and were attended, as wars always are, with great calamities; but notwithstanding this drawback, the land was well tilled in the intervals of peace, and manufactures were not altogether neglected. There was also a code of public opinion to which all classes yielded obedience, and which was the means of fostering probity in public life, and morality in the domestic circle. Literature, too, was held in great esteem. The ancient Irish had their bards or poet-musicians, and their chroniclers or historians. Phœnius, the founder of

the Milesian race, is said to have introduced into Ireland the arts of reading and writing, and a love for philosophy. He is invariably called by the old writers "the Sage;" and it is related of him that he appointed seventy men to disperse themselves all over the globe, and to make themselves acquainted with the various languages and dialects of the countries through which they travelled. At the expiration of seven years, they were to return to Ireland, and to make known the result of their observation and experience.

One of these seventy learned men was Gadel, or Gailag; and from his name Mr. O'Halloran, the historian, derives the word *Gaelic*. The Milesians may be regarded as the ancestors of the modern Celtic* population of Ireland; and if any reliance can be placed on the statements of the early annalists, who profess to derive their information from very ancient records, their history was full of noteworthy incidents, and it was, moreover, the history of a people who attached great importance, not only to the development of their physical strength, but still more to the cultivation of their intellectual gifts.

When, therefore, the Christian religion was first preached in Ireland, the Irish were prepared to accept

* The Celts formed a portion of the great Indo-Germanic race who, at a very early period, spread from east to west across Central Europe. The country whence they originally came is supposed to have been Galatia, in Asia Minor. They were, therefore, called Galatæ or Celtæ.

it, and to believe it, as a confirmation of many of the ideas which they already entertained, and also, as giving a sanction to many of the moral principles which they had been in the habit of enforcing. They would certainly have given their assent to such a statement as that which was made many ages after by Bishop Butler if it had been made to them by their Christian teachers, viz.: that "practical Christianity, or that faith and behaviour which renders a man a Christian, is like the common rules of conduct with reference to temporal affairs."

It is not possible to fix the precise date when Christian missionaries first landed in Ireland; but Eusebius (A.D. 325) tells us that some of the apostles crossed the ocean to "the British Isles;" and Chrysostom (A.D. 390) says that there were, in his time, many persons in the British Isles familiar with the Holy Scriptures. The use of the plural word "Isles" is suggestive. It almost irresistibly points to Ireland as well as to Great Britain.

Then, in A.D. 431, according to the Chronicle of Prosper, we find that "Palladius, having been first consecrated by Pope Celestine, was sent as the first bishop to *the Irish believing in Christ.*"*

The year A.D. 432 was rendered remarkable, as

* "Before the landing of the English in Britain, the Christian Church comprised every country, save Germany, in Western Europe as far as Ireland itself. The conquest of Britain by the Pagan English thrust a wedge of heathendom into the heart of this great communion, and broke it into

most writers of Irish Ecclesiastical History tell us—notably the Rev. Robert King—by the arrival in Ireland of the celebrated *St. Patrick*. The late Rev. Dr. Todd, S.F.T.C.D., fixed the date ten years later. Sir John Temple, whose knowledge of Church History does not appear to have been very profound, in his story of the Rebellion of 1641, assigns a date for the visit of St. Patrick which is at variance with the opinion of all other historians, if by the expression "fourth age" we are to understand fourth *century*. He says: "It is certainly not without some good grounds affirmed by ancient writers that in the fourth age after the Incarnation of our blessed Lord and Saviour, some holy and learned men came over out of foreign parts into Ireland, out of their pious desires to propagate the blessed Gospel throughout the kingdom, as Sedulius, Palladius, and, besides several others, *Patricius*, the famous Irish saint."

It is, however, clear from the almost universal testimony of ecclesiastical historians that it was not until towards the middle of the fifth century that St. Patrick began his celebrated mission in Ireland.

About St. Patrick—*Sanctus Patricius*—much of a controversial character has been written. By some he is regarded as a personage altogether mythical; by others, as a Christian bishop concerning whose

two unequal parts. On the one side lay Italy, Spain, and Gaul, whose churches owned obedience to the See of Rome; on the other the CHURCH OF IRELAND."—*Green's History of the English People*.

identity there can be no more doubt than there can be concerning that of St. Paul or St. Peter. It seems hardly necessary to say that no one who really knows anything at all about the matter can possibly regard St. Patrick as a mere myth, the hero of a series of legendary tales. He was unquestionably, and beyond all doubt, although not the first preacher of Christianity in Ireland, the founder of the "Church of Ireland," and the first occupant of the See of Armagh, which has ever since been the Primatial See of this country, as that of Canterbury is of England.

The Rev. Thomas Olden, M.R.I.A., in his translation of the "Epistles and Hymn of St. Patrick," thus describes the commencement of his missionary labours in Ireland:—"Having reached the neighbourhood of Tara on the eve of Easter, he made preparations for celebrating the festival, and proceeded to light his Paschal fire on the hill of Slane; but at this very time a great Pagan festival occurred, which began by the extinguishing of every fire in that country, and whosoever kindled one before the king's fire appeared on the hill of Tara, that soul should be cut off from his people. No sooner had the bright flame of the strange fire shot up into the evening air than the Druids recognised a rival power; they declared that the fire should be immediately extinguished, else it would get the better of their fires, and bring about the downfall of the kingdom. This was the first open contest between Christianity and Druidism in Ireland. It was a critical moment, and

the fate of his mission hung in the balance; but he was 'strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might.' 'Some' (he is reported to have said) 'put their trust in chariots, and some in horses, but *we* will remember the name of the Lord.' Ordered to appear before the king, the opportunity was afforded him which he so much desired, of preaching the Gospel in the presence of the rulers of the kingdom. It was on this occasion that he composed the *Irish Hymn*, which he sang as he approached the palace, and thus gave all to understand the foundation on which his courage rested. His exhortation failed to convince the king, though several of his followers became obedient to the faith; but he had gained much by successfully encountering the Druids in the head-quarters of their system, and he was thenceforward assured of victory."

One fact in the history of St. Patrick is now, thanks to the labours and researches of modern writers, placed beyond all dispute. It is this: that he never was at *Rome*, that he never had any episcopal commission from Rome, but that he was consecrated and sent to Ireland by some of the bishops of the Church of Gaul. A mere glance at his extant writings will convince the most sceptical that he did not regard himself as in any degree under the control of the Roman Church. "If," says Neander, one of the great ecclesiastical historians of Germany, "St. Patrick came as a deputy to Ireland from Rome, it might naturally be expected that in the Irish Church

a certain sense of dependence would always have been preserved towards the Mother Church at Rome. But we find, on the contrary, in the Irish Church afterwards a spirit of freedom similar to that shown by the ancient British Church which struggled against the yoke of Roman ordinances."

Another fact of importance is this: that St. Patrick in his teaching laid great stress on the Scriptural doctrine of salvation through the Divine Saviour. In the celebrated hymn which he sang at Tara, and to which allusion has already been made, he says:—

"Christ with me, Christ before me, Christ behind me,
Christ in me!
Christ below me, Christ above me,
Christ at my right, Christ at my left!
Christ in breadth, Christ in length, Christ in height.

"Christ in the heart of everyone who thinks of me,
Christ in the mouth of everyone who speaks to me,
Christ in every eye that sees me,
Christ in every ear that hears me!

"I bind myself to-day to a strong virtue, an invocation of the Trinity.
I believe in a Threeness with confession of a Oneness in the Creator of the universe."

There is in this magnificent hymn no reference whatever to the supposed mediatorial office of the Blessed Virgin, but a clear avowal of belief in a Triune God, and a distinct acknowledgment of the Divine power of Christ.

The Church of Rome in the days of St. Patrick had not admitted the worship of the Virgin Mary into her recognised formularies. The heresy was of much later date. The quotation given above is most valuable, as showing that Mariolatry, as it has been well called, could not have been sanctioned by the early Church, of which Rome claims to have been the head. If it had been, St. Patrick, supposing him to have derived his orders and his consecration from Rome, would hardly have composed so remarkable a hymn without some reference to a dogma of such unspeakable importance. But, in truth, St. Patrick never had any ecclesiastical connection with Rome, and "Litanies to the Virgin" were utterly unknown in any part of Christendom during the first seven centuries, at least, of the Christian æra.

St. Patrick's memory ought, undoubtedly, to be dear to all true-hearted Irishmen. They are quite unworthy of their country who treat with indifference one of the greatest names in her annals, or who are ignorant of the principal incidents of his life, and of the sublime truths which he loved and taught.

His father is said to have been a deacon named Calphurnius, and his grandfather a priest named Potitus. It is clear that, if this be true—and there is no reason to doubt its truth—clerical celibacy was not enforced during the age immediately preceding that in which St. Patrick lived. Celibacy, in fact, was not made compulsory on the clergy until Hildebrand, under the title of Gregory VII., became Pope, towards

the close of the eleventh century, six hundred years after the mission of St. Patrick to Ireland. There was a depth of meaning in this policy which can only be fathomed by those who know how powerful is the influence exercised by the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland at the present moment, whenever the authority of the Pope is called in question. By compelling every ordained man to lead a single life, Hildebrand severed him from society, forced him to sacrifice the noblest and purest of human affections—those that spring up in the domestic circle—and attached him for life to his Church and to his Order. The priest, after his ordination, was no longer a German, a Frenchman, a Spaniard, an Englishman, or an Irishman. He was a *Roman*, the subject of the Pope. Every country was alike to him. He was a minister and peer of an empire which claimed to extend over the globe. To quote the language of Phelan in his *Policy of the Church of Rome*—"Like the envoy or the minister of any foreign government, he observes the laws of the State in which his master may have placed him; and he respects, for a time, the authority of the local magistrate; but his Order is his country, the Pontiff his natural sovereign, and *their* welfare and *their* honour are the appropriate objects of his public care."

This policy was unknown in the days of St. Patrick, and for several centuries after his time. St. Patrick's father and grandfather were, as we have seen, ecclesiastics. There was then no law "forbidding to

marry;" but we have no evidence to show that St. Patrick himself was, like St. Peter, a married man.

At the age of sixteen he was taken captive at Dumbarton, in Scotland, where he then resided, and he was sold as a slave to Milcho, a Pagan prince, in the north of Ireland. For six years he endured all the bitter suffering of slavery, and at the end of that time he contrived somehow to regain his liberty.

There is a remarkable passage in his writings, in which he gives an account of the spiritual conflict through which he passed during the days of his captivity. Although born of Christian parents, he does not appear to have had any serious thoughts on the subject of religion until sorrow had brought him under discipline. "Up to the period of my captivity," he says in his *Confession*, "I knew not the true God; but in the strange land the Lord brought me to a sense of my unbelief; so that, although late, I called my sins to remembrance, and turned with my whole heart to the Lord my God, who regarded my low estate, took pity on my youth and ignorance, watched over me before I knew Him, protected me and comforted me as a father would his own son."

Feeling the power of the Gospel in his own heart, St. Patrick became intensely anxious for the spiritual welfare of the people of Ireland. Soon after he regained his freedom, he determined, notwithstanding the opposition of his parents and many friends, to return to the land of his captivity as a missionary,

and to bear to the Irish the glad tidings of salvation through Jesus Christ.

It is not possible to fix accurately the date of St. Patrick's ordination and consecration; but everything goes to prove that he was set apart to the sacred ministry in Gaul.

Some Roman Catholic historians would have us believe that Pope Celestine admitted him to Holy Orders, and commissioned him to preach to the Irish. Even Archbishop Ussher, the Rev. Robert King says, believed that St. Patrick had a commission from Rome; "but," adds Mr. King, "since the days of this eminently learned man, the question has been further sifted, and the additional light thus thrown upon it has tended to make it appear highly probable, or almost certain, that St. Patrick never was at Rome, and that he never received from Rome any commission whatsoever." The Rev. Thomas Olden tells us that the earliest accounts state that he was consecrated in Gaul by a bishop named Amathorex; "and this," he adds, "is the more probable from his intimate connection with that country."

Few missionaries have had such abundant success granted to them as St. Patrick had. We cannot believe all that is said about him. We cannot, for instance, give credit to the statement made about four hundred years after his death, that he founded in Ireland three hundred and sixty-five churches, that he consecrated three hundred and sixty-five bishops, that he ordained three thousand presbyters,

and that in Connaught alone he was the means of converting twelve thousand persons to the faith of Christ. There is evident exaggeration in all this; but that his mission work in Ireland was singularly successful, no one who has taken the trouble to find out what is really known about him can possibly doubt.

"The picture of his success," says Mr. Olden, "is sometimes drawn in very brilliant colours. It is said to have been rapid, bloodless, and complete; but this description is far from accurate. Missionary life has its successes and failures, its joys and sorrows; and if we are told of a career all sunshine and no shadow, we instinctively feel that the picture is overdrawn. *His* mission was no exception to this rule. He met with frequent opposition; his life was threatened and plotted against. On one occasion his charioteer was killed in mistake for himself. Many rejected his authority; and it has been inferred (according to Dr. Todd), from his placing fortifications around his ecclesiastical establishments, that he had little confidence in their security. Yet, after making all the allowance that truth requires, a survey of his labours will convince us that he occupies one of the very highest positions among the soldiers of the Cross, and is justly entitled to the honour of being named the *Apostle of Ireland*."

In the age immediately following that in which St. Patrick lived and laboured, the Church of Ireland produced many illustrious men, noted for their learn-

ing and for their zeal in promoting a knowledge of the Christian faith. Chief among these was St. Columba, the Apostle of the Highlands and western islands of Scotland, and founder and first Abbot of the celebrated Monastery of Iona. The more common name, Columbkill, or Columb of the Churches, by which he is usually distinguished, was given to him because of the great number of churches and monasteries which he founded. Columba died on the 9th June, 597. That day, therefore, is marked as his festival in the calendar of Irish saints. For the same reason the 17th March is chosen as "St. Patrick's Day" by Irishmen all over the world.

The literary fame of Ireland in those early days does not rest for its evidence on doubtful records, or on the testimony of unknown authors. It is interwoven with the ecclesiastical history of Europe. It is attested by the most trustworthy chroniclers.

Foremost among the books then studied by Irish scholars was the Bible. The philosophy of the age, such as it was, was not neglected. Poetry received some share of attention. The classics of Greece and Rome were read, and, to a great extent, appreciated. In the literature of those days, however, Holy Scripture filled the most prominent place, the place which of right belongs to it; and, as might naturally have been expected, the light of truth burst forth from Ireland to illuminate many of the countries of Europe which were then shrouded in Pagan darkness.

It was Columbanus, an Irishman, who converted the Suevi, the Boii, and the Franks of Germany. It was Kilianus, another Irishman, who brought the Gospel to the Eastern Franks. Gallus, the apostle of Switzerland, who has given his name (St. Gall) to one of the cantons of that remarkable country, was an Irishman. Batavia, Friesland, and Westphalia were brought to the profession of the Christian faith by Willibrord, who, although not an Irishman by birth, received his first religious impressions and his education in Ireland. Johannes Scotus Erigena, the great theologian of the ninth century, who opposed Paschasius Radbertus, the first promulgator of the doctrine known as "Transubstantiation," was an Irishman. The celebrity of the Irish schools for learning continued down to the eleventh century. We have interesting evidence of this in the life of Sulgen, who was appointed Bishop of St. David's, in Wales, about the year 1070, and who studied the Bible in Ireland, when a young man, for more than ten years.

"For three centuries after the time of St. Patrick," says the Bishop of Ossory, Right Rev. W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D., "Ireland was the favourite abode of learning and religion. Historians of different creeds and countries agree in pointing her out as the University of Europe, to which multitudes of students came from various lands, to receive instruction in divine and human wisdom. Even so late as the eleventh century, we find the Irish celebrated as a

nation famous for their knowledge of the Word of God. But not only was Ireland renowned as a depository of Scriptural truth. She was also the refulgent centre from which beams of Gospel truth were diffused throughout a great part of the Continent. When the nations of Germany and Northern Europe were sunk in heathenism, it was from Ireland principally that they received the knowledge of God. It was by means of her missionaries that two-thirds of Saxon England, and a great part of Scotland, were converted to the Christian faith."

"Ireland was formerly called the Island of Saints," said the late Bishop of Lincoln, Right Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., to the clergy assembled at his triennial visitation in Nottingham, October, 1882. "Fourteen hundred years ago," he added, "she was the burning and shining light of Western Christendom. In sacred and other learning she was in advance of England. The sons of our nobles and gentry were sent to Ireland for education. She was the University of the West. She was rich in colleges and schools, and trained our forefathers in sound learning, especially in the Word of God. She was also famous for missionary zeal. A great part of England owed its Christianity to Irish missionaries from the school of St. Columba in Iona. Ireland also evangelized countries on the Continent of Europe."

The British Army and Navy are justly proud of many victories gained over powerful foes in every

part of the world. Such names as those of Wellington and Nelson—names which stand at the head of a very long list of heroes—are deservedly had in honour. Our national banners have inscribed on them the names of places in which great battles have been fought, and splendid feats of valour have been witnessed. Those names will never be forgotten so long as there exists among us a spark of true patriotism.

The Church of Ireland, too, may be permitted to inscribe upon *her* banners the names of men who have fought the good fight of faith, and of places in which bloodless contests have been brought to an end by an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of Him who is the Prince of Peace. As a missionary Church, the ancient Church of this country may challenge the admiration of the whole world.

Let me here observe—and let no one be offended at the observation—that the Church of which I am now writing is pre-eminently and emphatically *the Church of Ireland*. She is not the Church merely of the Protestant Episcopalian portion of the population of Ireland, but the Church of the whole country, founded by St. Patrick, and holding still in spiritual matters the position which she has maintained for fourteen centuries. If she be not the Church of the majority of the Irish people, if she no longer possess the territorial jurisdiction which she once enjoyed; it is not that she has been untrue to her mission, unfaithful to her sacred obligations. The fault lies

not with her, but with those who, to serve their own political ends, in former times placed every obstacle in the way of her advancement towards the promotion of true religion, and who in these latter days cast her aside, in the vain hope that by so doing they would conciliate a turbulent mob, backed by the priesthood of a rival Church, "steeped to the lips" in hatred of everything that is English and Protestant.

This I shall endeavour to show further on. Meanwhile let me support the assertion which I have made above by two short quotations from the Charge of the late learned Bishop of Lincoln, to which I have already alluded.

"In the twelfth century," said the Bishop, "England, in her lust for conquest, betrayed Ireland into the hands of Rome; *and for four hundred years England tried to govern Ireland by means of Rome.*" And, alluding to recent events, the Bishop said:—"The Church of Ireland was making steady progress, and might, by salutary measures of reform, have become a blessing to her people, and have been restored to her primitive place in Christendom. But *England again interfered to blight her hopes.*"

## CHAPTER II.

### INVASION.

THE history of Ireland, both ecclesiastical and civil, during the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, was rendered memorable by many calamities. First France, then England and Scotland, and afterwards Ireland, suffered severely from the incursions of the Danes.

The Danes were distinguished in those days, as Lord Macaulay tells us, "by strength, by valour, by merciless ferocity, and *by hatred of the Christian name.*"

Under the blighting influence of these heathens, the Christian religion was upheld and maintained in Ireland with great difficulty, and in very many cases only at the risk of the lives of those who publicly professed their faith in Christ. Churches and abbeys, monasteries, colleges, and seminaries for the education of the clergy, were destroyed; libraries, valuable documents, and ancient records were committed to the flames; and in many places the worship of Woden and Thor was substituted for the worship of God through Jesus Christ. Three times in one month Armagh was burned and plundered.

Cork, Waterford, Limerick, Lismore, Ferns, Clonfert, Slane, Kildare, Clonmacnoise, Kells, Clonard, Glendalough, Swords, and many other Irish towns and villages were pillaged, and their inhabitants were put to death by the Danish barbarians.

At last it was determined to make a gigantic effort to conquer the whole of Ireland. Never before had the country been in such imminent danger. The Danes had established their iron rule in Great Britain from the Orkneys to the Scilly Isles; all that was now wanting to their complete supremacy was the conquest of Ireland. Extensive and mighty preparations were made for the attack. Every harbour in Norway, Denmark, France, England, and the Channel Islands was alive with ships, which were intended to convey the troops of the Danish invader to the Green Isle of the West. As so many isolated and defenceless towns had yielded to the Danish arms, it was expected that there would be little or no resistance, if a bold and determined attempt were made to destroy the independence of the whole land. Fortunately for Ireland, she then possessed a native sovereign whose courage and whose skill were equal to the occasion. Brian Boroihme—or Boru—that is Brian of the Tribute, who had been king of Munster, had become, partly by his valour, and partly by his skill in diplomacy, Ard-Ri, or supreme monarch of Erin; and the moment he heard of the intended invasion of his kingdom, he began his preparations for defence.

The Danish flotilla, under Admiral Brodar, entered Dublin Bay, on Palm Sunday, April 18th, 1014. The following Friday—Good Friday, April 23rd—the armies of Denmark and of Ireland came into collision at Clontarf. Brian himself, mounted on a richly caparisoned charger, rode through the Irish lines, exhorting the troops to remember the momentous issues that depended on the fortunes of that day—Religion and Country against Paganism and Bondage. It is said that, overcome with emotion, he delivered an address which roused his soldiers to the utmost pitch of enthusiasm. "Remember," he said, "that on this day Christ died for us on Mount Calvary; and you are about to fight for faith and fatherland." The brave troops of the Irish king did fight with a heroism worthy of the occasion. The Danes and their allies were defeated and fled, some in the direction of Dublin, and others to their ships. The intrepid king fell in the battle. He is said to have been killed by Brodar, the Danish admiral, who attacked him at a moment when he was off his guard.

This Battle of Clontarf was undoubtedly one of the most glorious events in the annals of ancient Ireland. The valour of Brian's troops on that day saved the country from being overwhelmed by the tide of heathenism. Christianity was upheld and maintained, and henceforward was cherished with greater fervour than it ever had been before. But the clouds of adversity soon began to gather. For a

century and a half disaster brooded over the land. Utterly broken down and dispirited, little by little the Irish people lost much of their ancient *prestige*. "England," says the late Mr. A. M. Sullivan in his *Story of Ireland*, "was becoming a compact nation, governed by concentrated national authority, and possessed of a military organisation formidable in numbers and in arms, but most of all in scientific mode of warfare, and perfection of military discipline; while Ireland, like a noble vessel amid the breakers, was absolutely going to pieces—breaking up into fragments or clans, north, south, east, and west. As a natural result of this anarchy, or wasting strife of factions, social and religious disorders supervened; and as a historian aptly remarks, the Island of Saints became an island of sinners. The state of religion was deplorable. The rules of ecclesiastical discipline were in many places overthrown, as was every other necessary moral and social safeguard; and inevitably the most lamentable disorders and scandals resulted."

It does not appear that during the period referred to in the foregoing quotation, any serious effort was made to restore the manly independence which had formed an essential feature in the national character of Ireland. At last, in a moment of despair, the Irish Church, clergy and laity alike, submitted to the yoke of Rome, imposed by England.

"It was through England," says the Rev. Robert King in his *Church History of Ireland*, "that

Ireland first became connected with the Roman Church, and subject to the authority of the Pope."

All extant historical records go to prove the accuracy of this statement.

There were in the reign of Henry II. five principal sovereignties in Ireland—Munster, Leinster, Meath, Ulster, and Connaught. As it had been usual for one of these to take the lead in war, there was generally some monarch who seemed to be in fact, although not by right, King of Ireland. In the year 1172, Roderic O'Connor held this dignity; but his authority, little respected as it was, even within his own territory, was insufficient to defend the country against foreign invasion. The ambition of the King of England had, very early in his reign, led him to contemplate what is erroneously called the "Conquest of Ireland." A pretext for landing and taking possession of the country was eagerly sought for. That pretext was furnished by the dissensions of the chieftains; but in order to give the enterprise a colour of justice, Henry II. had recourse to the Church of Rome.

Every reader of history knows that Henry II. began his reign by placing himself in antagonism to the Papal authority. As soon as Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, was dead, the king resolved to curb, in every way, the power of the clergy; and in order that he might be secure against all opposition, he promoted to the office of Lord Chancellor the celebrated Thomas à Becket. Not content with this,

he entrusted à Becket with the education of Prince Henry, his eldest son, and soon after commanded that he should be elected Archbishop of Canterbury.

Lord Tennyson, the Poet Laureate, in the magnificent drama which has lately entranced thousands of enthusiastic readers, has thrown a flood of light on the character of à Becket. So far from becoming the tool of the king, he defied the royal authority when that authority was used to curb the exorbitant power of the clergy. He gave his assent, it is true, to the "Constitutions of Clarendon;" but when the Pope refused to ratify those Constitutions, à Becket did not hesitate for a moment to obey the Pope, and to disobey the king. The contest ended, as we know, with the assassination of à Becket, a heinous crime, which was made a thousandfold more heinous by the peculiar circumstances under which it was committed, and by the exalted rank of the unhappy victim.

The news of à Becket's murder was received by the king with real sorrow, for it had been brought about by a few incautious words spoken by himself, which were never intended to produce so unfortunate a result. It was clearly a matter of importance that the Pope should be thoroughly convinced of the king's innocence of the murder; and the political affairs of Ireland just then came to his aid in a way which he could never have anticipated.

Two years after Henry's accession to the crown of England (1156), Adrian IV., better known as Nicholas Breakspear, issued a Bull, the object of which was to

bring the Irish Church under the dominion of Rome, and in it he gave the King of England full power and authority over Ireland. Mr. A. M. Sullivan says that "there is no such Bull in the Papal archives; yet," he adds, "it is credited that some such Bull was issued." It is beyond all doubt that nearly every historian of repute who has recorded the events of the reign of Henry II. makes mention of a Bull of this nature; and it is also highly probable that Adrian being an Englishman—the only Englishman who ever filled the Papal chair—would take every suitable opportunity of forwarding the interests of England, and those of the Church of Rome.

The Rev. Robert King states that both the Bull of Pope Adrian, and the confirmatory one of Pope Alexander III. (1159), are to be found in *Ussher's Sylloge*.

Here it will be necessary to go back a few years, and to see how Ireland was prepared to acquiesce in the Papal pretensions. In 1152, Cardinal Paparo arrived in Ireland as the Legate of Pope Eugenius III. He was accompanied by four English Archbishops. A Synod was held at Kells, in the County Meath (March 9th, 1152), and at that Synod palls were conferred on the four Archbishops of Ireland—Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. It may here be explained that the pall, or *pallium*, is a part of the ecclesiastical dress of a Roman Catholic Archbishop, which is sent by the Pope to one newly appointed to that dignity; and until the pall is

received the Archbishop cannot perform all the duties connected with his office. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh (1134), according to Rev. R. King, was the first Irish prelate who adopted this mark of submission to the Bishop of Rome. Bishop Mant says it was Archbishop Gelasius. The first person who filled the office of Papal Legate in Ireland is said to have been Gilbert, Bishop of Limerick, nominated in 1139.

The permission to invade and conquer Ireland, although given, as I have said above, by Pope Adrian IV. to Henry II. in 1156, was not acted upon until 1172. In the spring of that year Henry II., anxious to give some public intimation that he regarded with horror the murder of à Becket, took an oath on the relics of certain saints, in the presence of a distinguished assembly of ecclesiastics, that he had neither desired nor commanded the death of "the late Archbishop of Canterbury;" after which he received absolution, and was confirmed in the grant of Ireland made by Adrian sixteen years before. Alexander III. was the reigning Pope then.

Although it has been confidently asserted that no copy of the remarkable document issued by Adrian IV., and confirmed by Alexander III., is now in existence, yet in that which purports to be a true copy, and which is contained, as I have already said, in Archbishop Ussher's *Sylloge*, we find these words:—"Ireland and all the islands upon which Christ the Sun of Righteousness hath shined, and which

have received instruction in the Christian faith, do belong *of right to St. Peter and the Holy Roman Church.*" We also read that, "in token of submission to the claims of the Church, the Pope commands that each household shall pay as tribute one penny a year to him or to his representative." This tax is known as Peter's Pence.

It is hard to resist the conclusion that some definite instructions, in writing, regarding Ireland were given by Adrian IV. to the King of England, and that, when a suitable opportunity presented itself, the king proceeded to act on those instructions. A petty quarrel between the King of Leinster and the King of Connaught gave Henry II. a pretext for interfering, and Earl Strongbow was sent over with an armed force to restore peace. Then came in due time the royal progress through the newly-acquired territory. Setting out from Milford Haven, the English king landed in Waterford, and, at the head of five hundred knights, travelled from place to place, and received everywhere the homage of his new subjects. Most of the Irish chieftains were left in quiet possession of their estates; the English adventurers who accompanied the king had grants of land made to them, which in some cases were of considerable extent and value; Earl Strongbow was appointed Seneschal of Ireland, an office which invested him with all but royal dignity in the absence of the monarch; and after a visit of a few months Henry II. returned in triumph to England. "By these trivial

exploits," says Hume, "scarcely worth relating, except for the importance of the consequences, was Ireland subdued and annexed to the English crown."

*Except for the importance of the consequences!* Seldom, indeed, has any national acquisition of territory been attended with graver results. To the State the consequences of the visit of the King of England to Ireland may have been beneficial; to the Church they were in the highest degree disastrous.

There can be no greater mistake than to speak of this event as the "Conquest of Ireland," or to regard it as holding a similar position in history to the Conquest of England by William the Norman. It was a peaceful occupation of a country inhabited by a people worn out with internal dissension, and glad to accept any sovereign and any form of government, provided it were possible to obtain security for life and property, and freedom of action within the limits of the law. William the Conqueror had not merely to win the Battle of Hastings. He had to fight his way step by step, and to subdue a people for the most part unwilling to receive him. In the end he succeeded. England was conquered, and the Duke of Normandy established a royal dynasty which has lasted for more than eight hundred years. Ireland was never conquered. She was annexed to England in a moment of heavy affliction and mute despair. Happy would it have been for her if, after her first burst of sorrow and wrath was over, she had sought

to cultivate the friendship and win the esteem of England, whilst she preserved her own national traditions and usages. She did not do this. She has never attempted to do this. When the right hand of fellowship, even now, is held out to her, she sulkily refuses to grasp it; and instead of regarding herself as a component part of a mighty empire, she aspires to a separate nationality which has become impossible. The circumstances under which her union with England took place seven centuries ago were, no doubt, much to be deplored; but the union having taken place, it ought long ago to have been cemented by ardent love on both sides, and it ought to have become, with the lapse of each succeeding century, so firm as to be now indissoluble. This, unhappily, is not what has occurred. Political and religious differences have kept the two countries widely apart, and the estrangement has been deeply injurious to both.

In 1172 the terrible misfortunes which had been endured by the Irish clergy during the greater part of the preceding century, had so completely demoralized them, that they gladly welcomed any change for the better. When they heard of the Bull of Adrian IV., they came to the conclusion that to accept it would be to obtain relief from all their sufferings. Little did they know that they were imposing on themselves a yoke which they would soon find it hard to bear. Roger Hovenden says that "at Waterford all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of

Ireland came to the King of England, and received him for Lord of Ireland, swearing fealty to him and his heirs, and the power of reigning over them for ever; and then they gave him their instruments. And after the example set them by the clergy, the kings and princes of Ireland did receive Henry, King of England, for Lord and King of Ireland, and they became his men, and swore fealty to him and his heirs against all men."

This was the first step. The second followed as a natural consequence.

The King of England might now dictate laws to his faithful subjects in Ireland. Why should not the Church of England, which had acknowledged the supremacy, not merely the primacy, of Rome, also dictate laws to her "sister Church of Ireland"?

At various critical periods of Church history during many preceding centuries, councils or synods had assembled in various places for the purpose of deciding important questions concerning doctrine or discipline. Nicæa, Chalcedon, Constantinople, and many other places had become centres of interest, by reason of their connection with great events in ecclesiastical history. A great event in the ecclesiastical history both of England and Ireland was brought about by the intervention of Henry II. The king, acting under advice, required that a council or synod should be summoned "to make laws for the better regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland;" and the council was accordingly summoned under the royal sign-manual.

Cashel, in the county of Tipperary and province of Munster, was selected as the place in which the council was to meet and deliberate. Cashel was then the ecclesiastical metropolis of the south of Ireland, and a place of great importance. It was long called "Cashel of the Kings," because many Irish chieftains have been crowned in its noble cathedral. The ruins of this once magnificent Minster, including the chapel of King Cormac, are still in existence, and furnish one out of many proofs of the vitality as well as the splendour of the ancient Church of Ireland. "No person of taste or feeling," says Mr. John Davis White, in the Introduction to his *History of the City of Cashel*, "can see the ruined yet noble pile of buildings which crowns the Rock of Cashel, without being struck with admiration of their beauty and grandeur."

"Upon this rock," says the Venerable Henry Cotton, D.C.L., "have been erected at different periods—(1) A Round Tower, which is still entire. (2) A small but beautiful stone-roofed Church, of what is usually called the Norman style of architecture, built in the early part of the twelfth century by Cormac M'Carthy, King of Desmond or South Munster, and still familiarly known by the name of Cormac's Chapel. (3) Occupying the whole space between those buildings, and, as it were, embracing them, stands the larger Church or Cathedral, which was erected about the year 1169 by Donald O'Brien, King of Limerick."

It will be seen from this quotation that when Henry II. visited Ireland, the cathedral of Cashel had only just been completed; and it was but natural that a building of such stately proportions, and in such a commanding position, should have been selected as the meeting-place of the newly-summoned Synod.

Archbishops, bishops, and clergy assembled from every part of Ireland to constitute the Synod of Cashel. The king was represented by his domestic chaplain and the Bishop of Llandaff. The proceedings of this assembly have been described by several contemporary historians. Among these Giraldus Cambrensis occupies a foremost position. He gives a detailed account of the several rules which were framed for the guidance of the Irish Church, in the very words in which they were originally published. One of these rules effected a complete revolution in the internal affairs of the Church of Ireland. It ran as follows: "Those who die with a good confession shall be buried with suitable obsequies, and the accompaniment of Wakes and Masses. *Likewise all offices of Divine Service shall, for the future, in all parts of Ireland, be regulated after the model of Holy Church, according to the observance of the Church of England.*"

Ware, in his *History of the Bishops of Ireland*, tells us that Donald O'Hullican was the Archbishop of Cashel when the Synod was held. He tells us further, that the Pope's Legate and the Bishop of

Lismore presided. He then quotes the statement of Brompton, abbot of Ferval in Yorkshire, to the effect that "King Henry received from every archbishop and bishop, charters with their seals pendant, whereby they confirmed the kingdom of Ireland to him and his heirs, and testified that they constituted him and his heirs kings and lords of Ireland for ever." He goes on to say, on the authority of Roger Hovenden, that the king sent a transcript of these charters to Pope Alexander, who, by his apostolic authority, confirmed the said kingdom to him and his heirs, according to the letters of the archbishops and bishops. After this he sums up the canons enacted by the Synod in these words: "They forbid marriages within the prohibited degrees, and establish an exemption of Church lands from secular exactions, especially from coign and livery, cosheries and cuddies. They enact that the clergy shall not pay earic or composition for murder; that the children shall be baptised at the font, and catechised without the Church doors; that tithes of cattle, corn, and other profits shall be paid to the Parish Church; and that the sick shall make their wills before the priest and their neighbours. Their movables were to be divided, if they have children, into three parts, one to the wife, one to the children, the third to the performance of his will"—that is, to be disposed of according to the wishes of the testator. "If there be no children, then the goods to be divided into two parts, one to the wife, the other to the performance

of his will. If there be no wife living, but only children, then the goods to be divided into two parts, one to himself, and the other to his children. Also, that every Christian being dead shall be reverently brought to the Church and decently buried; that Divine Service be observed in Ireland as in England. And so," adds the historian, "having owned the king supreme in Church and State, he confirmed their canons; and at the same Synod the laws of England were thankfully received by all, and the observance of them confirmed by an oath."

The Synod of Cashel was undoubtedly the most remarkable council of the Church which was ever held in Ireland, until, in our own day, after her Disestablishment and Disendowment, the Church met, as she still meets, and as she will continue to meet, in her General and Diocesan Synods, to make laws for her own guidance, and to adopt such measures as will tend to promote pure religion throughout the whole land. It was at the Synod of Cashel that the Church of Ireland surrendered her independence, and acknowledged the authority of Rome. It was then that the Pope's supremacy, upheld by his Legate, was clearly admitted and publicly recognised by the representatives of the Irish Church. A Pope's "Legate for all Ireland" had, no doubt, been appointed so far back as the year 1139, but his authority was not universally acknowledged; and it is an admitted fact that when Cardinal Paparo distributed, as I have already said, palls to the archbishops

in 1152 at Kells, some of the Irish bishops and many of the clergy refused to sanction his proceedings by their attendance.

The enactments of the Synod of Cashel, unlike those of the Synod of Kells, were accepted by the whole body of Irish ecclesiastics. Thenceforward, until all Europe was convulsed by the preaching of the Reformers in the sixteenth century, the Popes and their Legates held undisputed sway in Ireland.

One fact, however, must be borne in mind. It is this: that the *laity* of the Church were not represented at the Synod of Cashel. Yet even in those days of old, when laymen possessed little or no education, and hardly any political power, they had shrewdness enough to look with suspicion on a clerical conclave which bartered away many of their ancient privileges, and which handed them over to the control, in spiritual matters, of a foreign bishop, resident on the banks of the Tiber. Resistance, however, was useless. Laymen of all ranks in Ireland, who were in immediate connection with the new English settlers, or who were to some extent dependent on them, adopted and carefully observed the rules of the English Church. A few, who lived in those parts of the country which were not easily accessible to the English, preserved, to some extent, their independence, and continued to carry out the ecclesiastical usages to which they had been accustomed just as if the Synod of Cashel had never been held. These laymen, however, gave no trouble.

Rome was dominant throughout the length and breadth of the land.

It may, at first sight, seem very strange that the whole body of the Irish clergy, who for centuries had resisted the encroachments of the Church of Rome, should not have banded themselves together in defence of what they must have deemed their rights, and should not have insisted strongly on being free from the control of an alien Church. But it must be remembered that foreign invasions and domestic troubles had unnerved them, and had made them unable to offer any resistance. The progress of religion and learning had been checked. The ardent desire for knowledge, and especially for knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, had been almost quenched amid the din of war. Then, when all was in a state of declension and decay, when the wail of distress was rising to heaven from ruined chieftains, from poverty-stricken peasants, and from pastors whose flocks were utterly unable to contribute to their support, English and Roman influences made themselves felt. For a moment the prospect brightened. The sun shone out from behind the clouds, and all looked peaceful and prosperous. Only for a moment. Again the angry clouds gathered; again the thunder of civil commotion was heard, and the sound of the Church's voice was completely lost in the roar of the conflicting elements.

The Synod of Cashel, from which so much was expected, only riveted more closely the chains which

England had fastened upon Ireland. Before long, Ireland was made to feel that she had completely surrendered her independence. The English colonists lived within "the Pale," whilst between them and those who lived outside its boundaries, a marked difference was soon established.

Within the Pale, the English settlers assumed an air of superiority which could not but give offence to those outside. The "mere Irish" were treated as little better than serfs, and were employed only as "hewers of wood and drawers of water" by the fortunate military adventurers who had formed the escort of Henry II., or who had afterwards obtained from him or his successors grants of fertile land for services said to have been rendered to the Crown. It is here that we must look for the origin of all those party feuds and those civil and religious dissensions which have made Ireland a by-word among the nations of the earth. It was at this time that the Celt and the Sassenach began to hate one another with the bitterest hatred. Later on the Celt was left, as we shall see in the course of this narrative, in the darkness of Romanism, whilst the Saxon Irishman became, like his friends and connections in England, a member of the Reformed Church; and so there sprang up another source of hatred—hatred fostered by religious differences. And, as if this were not enough, sentimentalists in this nineteenth century appeal to the "days of old," when Ireland was free and unfettered, when she had not submitted to the

yoke of England, and, on the strength of mere sentiment, clamour for Home Rule and a National Parliament. This introduces another element of discord, and we find so-called Nationalists and Constitutionalists taking opposite sides in politics. If English statesmen, who, as a rule, know very little about Ireland, really wish to understand why Ireland is in a condition of chronic discontent, and why vast numbers of Irishmen hate England, they must go back to the days of Henry II. and Adrian IV. It was the policy adopted by these two potentates seven hundred years ago, and persistently carried out by their successors until times comparatively recent, that made the Irish problem so difficult to solve during the last century. It was the selfishness of an English King, and the ambition of an English Pope, that have made the government of Ireland a task of surpassing difficulty, even for the most experienced rulers of the present day.

The last King of Ireland was Roderick O'Connor. He died in 1178, six years after the so-called "Conquest," at the age of eighty-two. Having reigned as King of Connaught for ten years, and as Supreme Ruler of Ireland for eighteen years, he spent the remainder of his life doing penance in the Monastery of Cong. With him the Irish monarchy fell, and the Irish Church gradually lapsed into all the errors and into all the vices which disgraced, all over Christendom, the Church of the "Middle Ages."

It is no great wonder that the Church became

corrupt in her doctrine, and the clergy dissolute in their lives, during the four centuries which immediately preceded the Reformation. The Bible was then, to all intents and purposes, a sealed book. It had been superseded by the Breviary, the Missal, and the *Acta Sanctorum*. The decree of Hildebrand concerning celibacy, to which I have already alluded, was rigidly enforced; and the annals of those days are, consequently, filled with accounts of the vicious and scandalous conduct of the clergy, the consequence of this unwarrantable interference with the Divine Law.

The corruption of the Church in matters of doctrine was increased by the rapid multiplication of the Monastic Orders during the eleventh and twelfth centuries; and Ireland did not escape the contagion. The land was overrun, in the course of a very few years after the arrival of the English settlers, by

> "Eremites and friars,
> White, black, and gray, with all their trumpery,"

as Milton graphically describes them.

The Benedictines, and Augustinians, during the interval which elapsed between the reign of Henry II. and the Reformation, possessed many large establishments in Ireland, and exerted a great deal of influence over the people. They took the lead in advancing Papal authority throughout the land. Out of each of these arose several minor Orders. The Benedict-

ines were divided into Clugniacensians or Monks of Clugny, Camaldulensians, Cistercians, Grandimontans, and Carthusians; the Augustinians into Aroasians, Victorines, Gilbertines, and Premonstratenticians. Some of these minor Orders were represented in Ireland.

Then there were the Mendicant Friars, classed as Dominicans, or Black Friars, and Franciscans, or Grey Friars. The Mendicant Monks, in the twelfth century, had become necessary to the very existence of the Church of Rome. The other Orders had become wealthy, and wealth had engendered sloth. Obedience to the dictates of the Supreme Pontiff had become lax; and heretics were suffered to spring up in all directions. There was, therefore, an absolute necessity for a body of men who would inculcate and insist on obedience to Papal authority. The first person who perceived this, and who supplied the want that had arisen, was Innocent III., the Pope who placed England under an interdict during the reign of King John. He sent these Mendicant Monks all over the world; and that he might increase their power, he exempted them from the jurisdiction of the bishops of the several countries which they visited, and declared them to be responsible *immediately and solely to the See of Rome.* "During two centuries," says Mosheim, "they had the direction of nearly everything in Church and State; they held the highest offices, both ecclesiastical and civil, taught with almost absolute authority

in all the schools and churches, and defended the authority and majesty of the Roman Pontiffs against the *kings, bishops, and heretics,* with amazing zeal and success." They certainly left their mark upon Ireland.

Besides the Orders above-mentioned there were to be found in Ireland during the twelfth and four following centuries, Carmelites or White Friars, and Eremites of St. Augustine, or Austin Friars. There were other Orders of Monks in England and on the Continent; but those mentioned above comprise all who came to Ireland, except the Friars de Penitentiâ Jesu Christi. They appeared in Ireland in 1268, and founded one, and only one, establishment, and that was in Dublin. Convents belonging to all the other Orders were to be seen all over the country. Most of them now form very picturesque ruins.

Whilst the Popes were strengthening the power of the Church of Rome in Ireland, the Kings of England were extending their own authority through the medium of the Bishops of the Irish Church. There were incessant disputes about the appointments made to Bishoprics in Ireland. The Irish clergy never failed to remonstrate, when they had an opportunity of doing so, against the unfairness of placing foreign rulers over the Church; but the result of all these disputes and of all these remonstrances almost invariably was that the episcopal office was filled by Englishmen devoted to the Papal interest, who, with the help of the English Government, used all their

energies for the removal of everything which was supposed to be distinctive of Ireland's ancient Church, and thus destroyed the last relics of her independence.

In "Certain Decrees for the Reformation of Ireland," as quoted by the Rev. Canon Philip Dwyer in his History of the Diocese of Killaloe, John Travers deplores the state of the inhabitants of the realm in these terms:—"For the more part, they have of long time and yet hitherto be ignorant of the true doctrine of Christ for lack of preaching of the same, which hath caused them to neglect due obedience to God and the king. It shall be for remedy thereof necessary that the Archbishop of Dublin, my Lord of Meath, and such others as favour the Gospel, do instruct the Irish Bishops of this realm, causing them to relinquish and renounce all Popish or Papistical doctrine, and to set forth sincerely within each of their dioceses the true Word of God." Canon Dwyer tells us further that among the special requests made in the reign of Henry VIII., by Moroghe O'Brien, Earl of Thomond, was the following:—"That there may be sent into Ireland some well-learned Irishmen, brought up in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, not being infected with the poison of the Church of Rome. And they to be approved first by the King's Majesty, and then to be sent *to preach the Word of God in Ireland.*" *

* "This is a work which is a credit to our Church. Since *Phelan's Remains*, nothing like it has appeared. It reminds

That Ireland rapidly degenerated after the Synod of Cashel had placed the Church under the control of the See of Rome, no one who knows anything about her past history can doubt. Bishop Mant, writing of the events which followed the visit of Henry II. to Ireland, says: "Of the moral condition, indeed, of the lower Irish during the period in question, a sketch has been drawn in recent times by an ecclesiastic of high dignity in the Romish Church in Ireland, as cited by Dr. Phelan in his History; and by him they are represented as exhibiting ferocity combined with cunning, and astuteness with cruelty, as characterized by individual bravery and collective cowardice, and as generally estranged from honesty and truth. The features of this portrait, it is to be hoped, are exaggerated; but the delineation had probably too near a resemblance to the original as it may be traced in the occurrences of the times. Upon the whole, whatever pretensions may have been justly

one of the best school of English Church Historians. It is a disgrace to us that a second edition has not been called for long before this. It will be a disgrace to our University if some mark of honour is not paid to the learned and laborious author. It is an honour to the University, when it is the fashion to run her down. Every Irish clergyman ought to possess it. If he has not the industry to study it, or the head to value or understand it, the world would give him credit for both, if Canon Dwyer's splendid work, splendid in every sense, were seen on his table."—*Canon Crosthwaite, V.G., in his Pamphlet entitled, "Which Church has Orders from St. Patrick?"*

advanced by Ireland in previous ages to the title of 'Island of Saints,' an examination of its subsequent condition shows that its profession of Christianity had become such as to preclude its continued claim to that appellation; that it had fallen many degrees below the standard of evangelical purity and simplicity, and was weighed down by a burden of corruption and error during the centuries under review; and was abundantly in need of improvement in its profession and practice of religion, in the character of its clergy and people, and in the ordinances of its Church at the æra of the Reformation."

I have now reached the second stage in my narrative.

It seems clear, from all the evidence before us, that in the interval between the middle of the twelfth and the middle of the sixteenth century, the Church of Ireland, under the blighting influences of Rome, had sadly declined in faith and morals, that her light burned very dimly, and needed to be rekindled. How, in the providence of God, she returned to her ancient creed, and again held aloft the torch of Divine Truth, we shall see as we proceed with our investigation into her past history.

## CHAPTER III.

### REFORMATION.

IN the beginning of the sixteenth century the Christian religion had become so changed from what it had been when it was delivered to the world by Christ and His Apostles, and the teaching of the clergy so entirely different from the teaching of the inspired writers of the New Testament, that it seemed as if the whole human race were about to be enveloped once more in the dismal darkness of heathenism. The higher classes of society all over Europe, when not actually engaged in war, were immersed in sensual living. The lower classes were in a condition little, if at all, better than that of slaves. The clergy, who formed a sort of connecting link between the two, were ignorant, rapacious, ambitious, and spent their time in "serving divers lusts and pleasures." They certainly seemed to live as though heaven and hell were mere names, not vivid realities. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné tells us, on undoubted authority, that Pope Leo X. was in the habit of speaking of the Christian faith as a "fable" from which he derived all his wealth and power. "*Quantum nobis prodest,*" he used to say, "*hæc fabula Jesu Christi.*" D'Aubigné tells us, too, that Cardinal Bembo was

ashamed to write the words "Holy Ghost," lest he should be ridiculed by the learned men of Rome; and he therefore used what he regarded as a more classical phrase—"the breath of the heavenly Zephyr." It is also related of this Prince of the Church that when he saw a pious man one day engaged in translating the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, he said to him—"Let these childish matters alone; such fooleries do not become a man possessed of common sense." Now and then a glimmer of light shot across the dark abyss; but it only served, to use Milton's phrase, to make "darkness visible." The few earnest followers of Christ who, in the loneliness of their cloisters, mourned over the general decay of religion, as Jeremiah mourned over the apostacy of his own countrymen, longed for a change, but how to bring it about they knew not.

At last the key-note of true religion was struck by Martin Luther. Every one knows how he shook the world; how he roused all Christendom from the deep sleep of ages.

The "Reformation," begun in Germany, soon extended its influence to England and to Ireland. Henry VIII., a king of whose moral character it is impossible to say a word of commendation, became, strange to say, in the hands of God, the great promoter of the Reformation in England. A more unwilling instrument it would have been impossible to find; but God made use of him to carry out His own purposes of mercy to His Church. Nobody who has

studied history can suppose that Henry VIII. held any of the theological opinions now held by Protestants. He merely asserted as a king his own supremacy within his own dominions, in opposition to the Pope's supremacy, whenever the Pope came into conflict with him on matters which concerned the internal government of the Church of England; but to the last day of his life he accepted every dogma of the Church of Rome. He attacked Luther's writings, and was rewarded by the Pope with the title, "Defender of the Faith." He ordered Sir Thomas More, and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, to be beheaded for asserting their belief in the Pope's supremacy; and he had Bilney, Frith, Anne Askew, and many other persons burned for refusing to believe in Transubstantiation. So that whilst it is an undoubted fact that Henry VIII. promoted the Reformation in England, it is equally true that he was influenced by political rather than by religious motives. It is most important to bear this in mind; and to insist upon the truth of this statement when we have an opportunity of doing so, for there is not an Irish Roman Catholic Priest or Bishop who has been trained in Maynooth who has not been told that the Church of Ireland was established by Henry VIII., and that the doctrines which she holds to be true, emanated from his royal brain. The Maynooth ecclesiastic accepts this falsehood as an undeniable truth, and communicates it to his flock, who can hardly refuse to believe what they hear from their

pastor. Both pastor and flock are deserving rather of pity than blame. On such a subject as this no ray of light can possibly be expected to irradiate the inner chambers of the skull of a Maynooth student.

On the 3rd November, 1534, Parliament conferred on the king the title of "Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England," as it had already invested him with all the real power belonging to that office; and it was but natural that the king, having succeeded in getting his supremacy acknowledged by the clergy of England, and confirmed by the High Court of Parliament, should be anxious to establish his supremacy equally over the Church of Ireland. He encountered, however, more opposition than he had expected. Cromer, Archbishop of Armagh, was determined that the Papal supremacy should be upheld, and most of his clergy cordially supported his views.

In Dublin, the king was more successful. The archbishopric being vacant, he appointed Dr. Browne, an Englishman, who appears to have been filled with a desire to promote the reformation of the Church, and who looked upon the declaration of the Royal supremacy as the first step in that direction. But Archbishop Browne found that he had undertaken a work of great difficulty. He had many enemies, who perpetually thwarted his plans. In a letter to Lord Cromwell, the King's vicegerent, as he was called, quoted by Bishop Mant, the Archbishop complains bitterly of the Lord Deputy, Lord Leonard Grey,

"who," he says, "though a zealous robber of churches, is equally a favourer and practiser of image-worship, and generally well disposed to the Popish corruption." He adds—"So doth he aid me in my Prince's cause, I think the simplest holy-water clerk is better esteemed than I am. I beseech your Lordship, in the way of charity, either cause my authority to take effect, or else let me return home again unto the cloister. When that I was at the worst, I was in better case than I am now, what with my Lord Deputy, the Bishop of Meath, and the pecuniose Prior of Kilmainham."

The king's obstinate determination, however, surmounted all obstacles. The Archbishop of Dublin recommended that the king's supremacy should be established by Act of Parliament in Ireland. It was perfectly well understood that the recommendation, when obtained, amounted to a Royal mandate. The Irish Parliament met in Dublin in 1537. The clergy, with few exceptions, signified their *dissent*, but to no purpose. The enactment passed, and Ireland took the first step in the direction of Protestantism. The next step, taken shortly afterwards, was one in a retrograde direction. An Act was passed for the encouragement of "the English order, habit, and language;" which required that "spiritual promotion should only be given to such persons as could speak *English*, unless, after four proclamations made in the next market town, such could not be had." The same Act further enjoined that English

parochial schools should be established in the country, and that all clergymen should be bound by oath to endeavour to learn and teach the English tongue, to "bid the beads" in English, and to preach the Word of God in English, "*if he can preach.*"

The king's supremacy was thus pressed upon the Church of Ireland, and, before long, received at least a silent acquiescence from all classes; but English, as distinguished from *Irish*, the language of the people, was also forced upon the clergy and their flocks. At the same time the Church was systematically robbed. Abbey lands were bestowed on the king's favourites among the nobility, who received the Rectorial Tithes of parishes attached to the abbey, whilst the clergy who discharged spiritual duties within those parishes were obliged to be content with the Vicarial or Impropriate Tithes. The evil effects of this robbery, for it was nothing else, have been keenly felt ever since. Monasteries were dissolved on all sides, but not a single school or college was endowed with the funds which were thus obtained. Bishop Mant says: "When he"—the king—"relieved the Church from the impediment of monastic institutions, he forbore to provide thereby for the religious education of her people, as well as to bestow upon her any secular benefit, and left her incapacitated for necessary activity, and beset by difficulties." Hume tells us that "great murmurs were everywhere excited on account of these violences; and men much questioned whether priors

and monks, who were only trustees and tenants for life, could by any deed, however voluntary, transfer to the king the entire property of their estates. In order to reconcile the people to such mighty innovations, they were told that the king would never thenceforth have occasion to levy taxes, but would be able, from the abbey lands alone, to bear, during war as well as peace, the whole charges of Government. "While such topics," he adds, "were employed to appease the populace, Henry took an effectual method of interesting the nobility and gentry in the success of his measures. He either made a gift of the revenues of convents to his favourites and courtiers, or sold them at low prices, or exchanged them for other lands on very disadvantageous terms."

I have already said that when Henry VIII. insisted on his own supremacy in opposition to that of the Pope, he merely wished to defend what he believed to be his Royal rights against the encroachments of an Italian Prelate. He had no wish to interfere with the theological teaching of Rome. When Primate Cromer died, he appointed as his successor George Dowdall, a man strongly attached to the interests of Rome, and decidedly opposed to the Reformation; so much so, that although he consented to receive his nomination from the king, he would not be satisfied until he had had his appointment ratified by the Pope.

And yet, after all, the establishment of the Royal supremacy was an event of the greatest importance.

It was, indeed, the event upon which the whole of the Church History of the next three reigns turned. It made Reformation possible, and practicable. There was no hope that Protestantism would make any way in Ireland, so long as the Church recognised the Bishop of Rome as her Supreme Head, and consented to remain at his will bound in the chains of slavery. The first blow in the direction of freedom was struck when the Head of the State was acknowledged to be also the Head of the National Church.

There was another advantage gained. It was but natural that the king should allow the men who had helped him to establish his supremacy a good deal of their own way; and so the exertions of Archbishop Browne, of Staples, Bishop of Meath, and others, were made instrumental in the correction of abuses. It was by these men, and others like-minded, that images and other objects of superstitious veneration were removed from many churches, to make way for English translations of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments.

In 1547, Henry VIII. died in the fifty-sixth year of his age. A month before his death he made his will, and in it he confirmed the Act of Parliament which settled the succession to the Crown first "on Prince Edward, then on the Lady Mary, and afterwards on the Lady Elizabeth." The two princesses were bound, under penalty of forfeiting the Crown, not to marry without the consent of the Council

which he appointed to carry on the Government during the minority of the young Prince.

Long before Henry VIII. was born, there were indications perceptible to the observant, of a coming change in matters of religion, and these indications were visible in Ireland as well as in England. Like the sighing of the wind, which often precedes a fierce gale, murmurs were sometimes heard which pointed to the approach of a storm of such tremendous violence that the corruptions of the Papacy would be swept away before it as though they were mere straws. A curious instance of this occurs to me just at this moment. The *Vision of Pierce Plowman* is a satirical poem ascribed to Robert Longlande, who lived in the middle of the fourteenth century. The poet refers to the spread of the doctrines which were silently bringing about the Reformation, and he utters a remarkable prophecy. It is important to bear in mind that it has been satisfactorily shown that these lines were not inserted in the poem *after the event*. They were really prophetic. The writer says:—

"And there shall come a King and confess you, Religious;
And beat you, as the Bible telleth, for breaking of your Rule;
And amend monials, monks, and canons,
And put them to her penance ———

* * * *

And then shall the Abbot of Abingdon and all his issue for ever
*Have a knock of a King, and incurable the wound.*"

The prophecy, as we have seen, was abundantly fulfilled. What Henry VIII. began, his young son continued, and would have completed if he had lived long enough. Edward VI. had been brought up as an uncompromising Protestant. But his reign lasted only six years. "He possessed," says Hume, "mildness of disposition, application to study and business, a capacity to learn and judge, and an attachment to equity and justice." But Hume was utterly incapable of estimating the religious side of the young king's character, and so he adds this oracular decision:—"He seems to have contracted, from his education, and from the genius of the age in which he lived, too much of a narrow prepossession in matters of religion, which made him incline somewhat to bigotry and persecution; but as the bigotry of Protestants, less governed by priests, lies under more restraints than that of Catholics, the effects of this malignant quality were less to be apprehended if a longer life had been granted to young Edward."

If, indeed, a longer life *had* been granted to him, both England and Ireland might have been spared many calamities. But God ordered it otherwise. Fortunately, the Bishoprics of Ireland had been filled during the later years of the reign of Henry VIII. by men who were determined to uphold the principles of the Reformation. Before the Royal Supremacy had been firmly established, appointments to Bishoprics were made by Papal nomination, the temporalities of the See being granted to the new Bishop by

the king's writ. After the king had asserted what he believed to be his legitimate right, the appointment proceeded from the *Crown*, and if (as in a few cases) the Pope interfered, the nomination was rendered valid by the confirmation of the king, consequent on the oath of allegiance being taken, or homage being done, or submission being made, and fealty sworn to the king by the ecclesiastic selected to fill the vacant See. During the eleven years which intervened from 1536 to 1547, thirteen vacancies occurred. In four cases appointments were made by provision of Paul III., and confirmed by the king, *on submission being formally plighted.* These were Clonmacnoise, 1539; Down and Connor, 1541; Clonfert, same year; and Clogher, 1542. On the other hand, in nine cases, the appointments were primarily and entirely of the king's nomination and donation. These were Tuam, Cork and Cloyne (united), and Clonfert, 1536; Kildare, 1540; Ardagh, 1541; Armagh, and also Emly, 1543; Elphin, 1544; and Killaloe, 1546. In certain cases there were *rival appointments* by the Pope; for instance, Cork and Cloyne, 1536; Clonfert, same year; Kildare, 1540; Armagh, 1542; but these were rejected, and rendered null, by the king's authority, and the Bishops of the royal nomination were settled in their respective Dioceses, except Clonfert, where the king preferred Dr. Nangle; but "one Rowland Burke," says Bishop Mant, "purchased Bulls from the Bishop of Rome, whereby he expulsed the king's presentee." How-

ever, Burke, who had been advanced to the See by the Pope's Bull, afterwards submitted and swore fealty to the king, and obtained the royal assent in October, 1541, the Pope's Bull having previously been cancelled.

It will be seen from the foregoing statement that when Edward VI. succeeded to the throne, the several dioceses of Ireland were ruled by Bishops who were for the most part attached to the principles of the Reformation, and who upheld the Royal against the Papal Supremacy. Bishop Burnet remarks that the Reformation made but small progress in Ireland during the reign of Edward VI. "It was received," he says, "among the English, but I do not find any endeavours were used to bring it in among the Irish." The shortness of the reign, the youth of the king, and his delicate health; above all, the political troubles which were brought about by some of his own relations, will sufficiently account for this. Something, however, was done. Men of high character were appointed to the Episcopate, the English Reformed Liturgy was introduced, preparations were made for its translation into Irish, the Bible was more freely circulated than it had ever been before, except in the days which preceded the English Settlement, and every encouragement was given to those of the clergy who were known to be active in preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Bishop Bale took a very prominent part in the ecclesiastical history of this reign. He was one of

the most zealous and decided antagonists of Romish abuses in Ireland, and one of the most strenuous advocates of the Reformed Religion. He was educated first at the Carmelite Convent at Norwich, and afterwards at Jesus' College, Cambridge, at which time, by his own confession, "ignorance and blindness had wholly possessed him." During the reign of Henry VIII. he was thrown into prison for preaching against the invocation of saints, and the worship of images. He withdrew to Germany as soon as he obtained his liberty, and on the accession of Edward VI., he returned to England. Soon after his return, the king selected him to fill the See of Ossory, and he, at once, betook himself to Kilkenny, where he patiently and perseveringly preached the Gospel. Of his own preaching he gives the following account:—"I earnestly exhorted the people to repentance for sin, and required them to give credit to the Gospel of salvation; to acknowledge and believe that there is but one God; to Him alone, without any other, sincerely to offer worship; to confess one Christ for an only Saviour and Redeemer, and to trust in none other man's prayers, merits, nor deservings, but in *His* alone for salvation." He also used every exertion to have the Book of Common Prayer introduced into the Churches of his diocese, but he found, to his great vexation, that the opposition of his clergy made these endeavours in many cases unsuccessful.

Bishop Burnet calls King Edward VI. "that

incomparable young prince." He was, at the time of his death, sixteen years of age, "and was counted," so the bishop tells us, "the wonder of that time. He was not only learned in the tongues and other liberal sciences, but knew well the state of his kingdom. . . . He had, above all things, a great regard to religion. He took notes of such things as he heard in sermons which more specially concerned himself, and made his measures of all men by their zeal in that matter. This made him so set on bringing over his sister Mary to the same persuasions with himself, that when he was pressed to give way to her having Mass, he said, that he would not only hazard the loss of the Emperor's friendship, but of his life, and all he had in the world, rather than consent to what he knew was a sin; and he cited some passages of Scripture that obliged kings to root out idolatry; by which he said he was bound in conscience not to consent to her Mass, since he believed that it was idolatry; and did argue the matter so learnedly with the bishops, that they left him, being amazed at his knowledge in Divinity. So that Cranmer 'took cheek by the hand'* upon it, and said, 'he had reason all the days of his life to rejoice that God had honoured him to breed such a scholar.' All men who saw and observed these qualities in him, looked on him as one raised by God for most extraordinary

* "Took cheek by the hand," a current phrase of that day, signifying, felt greatly encouraged.

ends; and when he died, concluded that the sins of England must needs be very great that had provoked God to take from them a Prince under whose government they were like to have seen such blessed times. He was so affable and sweet-natured that all had free access to him at all times; by which he came to be most universally beloved, and all the high things that could be devised were said by the people to express their esteem of him. The fable of the Phœnix pleased him most; so they made his mother one Phœnix, and himself another, rising out of her ashes. But graver men compared him to Josiah; and long after his death I find, both in letters and printed books, they commonly named him Our Josias; others called him Edward the Saint."

On the death of Edward VI., the Crown devolved, according to the will of Henry VIII., and the Act of Parliament passed in the thirty-fifth year of his reign, on Edward's eldest sister, Princess Mary. The story of Lady Jane Grey's brief reign of ten days, and subsequent execution, is too well known to need repetition here. Queen Mary made a triumphal entry into London, and when she reached the Tower, her first act was to restore to liberty the Duke of Norfolk, Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, the Duchess of Somerset, and Lord Courtney, who were all zealous Roman Catholics. The English Liturgy, which had been introduced into Ireland in 1551, was immediately, on the accession of Queen Mary, pushed aside to make way for the Roman Missal. Several

Protestant bishops, too, were "deprived," and their places filled by Papal emissaries. Amongst others, Archbishop Browne was removed from his See, and Dr. Hugh Curwen, who received his consecration in St. Paul's, London, was sent over to take his place. Primate Dowden made himself specially active in the restoration of Popery; and a Provincial Synod was held (1554) in St. Peter's Church, Drogheda, at which enactments were passed which were destructive, so far as they went, of the principles of the Reformation. The following year (1555) a Jubilee, intended to express joy at the return to what was called "the old religion," was held all over Ireland. In 1556 a second Provincial Synod was held in Drogheda, in order to confirm the acts of the Synod of 1554. During the same year a similar Provincial Synod was held in Dublin. The earliest acts of the Irish Parliament directed against the doctrines of the Reformed Church were passed on the 1st June, 1556. Everything seemed to indicate that the authority of the Pope was to be restored all over England and Ireland. In England fire and sword were mercilessly resorted to. Philip of Spain, the consort of Queen Mary, breathed forth "threatenings and slaughter" against all heretics, with all the violence that marked the action of the "Holy Roman Inquisition" in the land of his birth. Rogers, Prebendary of St. Paul's; Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester; Taylor, Parson of Hadley; Ferrar, Bishop of St. David's; Ridley, Bishop of London; and Latimer,

Bishop of Worcester, with an immense number of persons of inferior station, were publicly burned. Altogether, 277 persons, including 55 women and 4 children, were brought to the stake; and a mixed multitude of all classes suffered punishment by imprisonment, fine, and confiscation. When this had been done, a solemn embassy was sent to Rome to report progress. It consisted of Sir Anthony Brown, who had been created Viscount Montacute, the Bishop of Ely, and Sir Edward Carne. Pope Paul IV. then filled the Papal chair. He told these three English ambassadors plainly that he was grievously offended at Queen Mary retaining among her titles that of Queen of Ireland. It was *his* prerogative, he said, to erect new kingdoms and to abolish old ones; but in order to avoid all disputes with his new converts, he consented to erect Ireland into a new kingdom, and he then admitted the title as if it had been originally granted by himself.

Another point in discussion was not so easily settled. The Pope insisted that the property which had been alienated from the Church should be restored to the uttermost farthing; and the queen, when the demand was made known to her, not only consented to restore all the Church lands which were in the possession of the Crown, but actually undertook to erect several new convents and monasteries. Some members of her Council ventured to object to this measure, but the queen replied that she valued the salvation of her soul more than any earthly

possessions, and no further objection seems to have been made.

Ireland escaped the furious persecution which for nearly five years raged fiercely in England. Indeed, notwithstanding the well-known cruelty of the queen and her Spanish husband, Protestantism actually made some little progress among the people of Ireland. At last the queen determined to take steps to compel submission to the Papal yoke all over Ireland; and so she sent over Dr. Cole, one of her commissioners, with special orders to do here what Bonner and Gardiner had so effectually done in England. Cox, the historian, relates how strangely the queen's plans were frustrated; and because the story may appear to some untrue or exaggerated, he takes care to inform us that he vouches for the truth of it on the authority of "the Most Reverend and Learned Primate, Archbishop Ussher, and the Memorials of the Most Noble and Illustrious Richard Earl of Cork." It appeared first in the Life of Archbishop Browne.

Dr. Cole, we are told, on his way to Ireland, stopped at Chester, and being in conversation with the Mayor of the city, he took out of his travelling bag a leather box, and said to him: "Here is a commission that shall lash the heretics of Ireland." The words were heard by the Mayor's wife, who had a brother living in Dublin. Watching her opportunity, this clever woman—she must have been an Irishwoman—took the commission out of the leathern case,

and put into it a pack of playing cards, the *knave of clubs* being uppermost. In due time Dr. Cole arrived in Dublin. Lord Fitzwalters, the Lord Deputy, summoned the Privy Council to receive the queen's commands. Dr. Cole made a speech. He told the Council why he had been sent over, and opening his despatch-box, proceeded to lay before the assembly his commission. But the commission had disappeared, and in its place all that could be found was the pack of cards. Then the Lord Deputy made answer: "Let us have a new commission, and we will shuffle the cards in the meantime." The Doctor, we are informed, was greatly troubled in his mind. He soon after returned to England, where he obtained from the Court another commission. There were in those days no City of Dublin mail steamers, or North Wall boats, and there were no railway trains. The unfortunate Doctor had not only to travel slowly by coach in England, but he had to wait a long time at Holyhead for a favourable wind to carry him across the Channel. Meanwhile news arrived that the queen was dead. Dr. Cole did not think it worth his while, under these altered circumstances, to encounter the perils of the deep, to face what Archdeacon Dennison so graphically called, some years ago at the Church Congress held in Dublin, our "sixty miles of stormy water;" so he remained in England; "and thus," says the chronicler of these interesting events, "God preserved the Protestants of Ireland."

The heroine of this incident in Ireland's history was Elizabeth Edmonds. Queen Elizabeth, when she heard the story some time afterwards from Lord Deputy Fitzwalters, determined that the ingenuity of her namesake should not go unrewarded; and so she settled on her a pension of £40 a-year for life.

Queen Mary died November 17th, 1558. She was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth.

The education of Queen Elizabeth, as well as her personal predilections, led her to favour the Reformation. She determined at once to undo all that had been done by her predecessor to favour the advance of Romanism. Before long, the English Liturgy was restored in the Church of Ireland. Christ Church and St. Patrick's, the two Dublin Cathedrals, were repainted, and texts of Scripture on the walls took the place of pictures of Popish miracles. Both in England and in Ireland the queen determined to make her power felt.

Parliament was summoned to meet in January, 1560; and an Act was, at once, passed, restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction of the State over the Church, and "abrogating all foreign power repugnant to the same." This was plainly a blow aimed at the pretensions of Rome.

"Good Queen Bess," as she has often been called, inherited much of her father's imperious nature. She was not a woman who would allow her commands to be disobeyed, or her dignity to be trifled with. She was just as ready to box the ears of a

courtier, as to "unfrock a bishop," and, therefore, it could not be doubted that the Church to which she adhered would be, in the strict and legal sense of the word, "established" throughout her dominions. Measures were accordingly taken to make the Protestant Episcopal Religion—represented in this country by the Church of Ireland—the "Establishment:" and no greater tribute to the genius and foresight of Queen Elizabeth can be paid than to say that the Church with which she cast in her lot is still the National Church of England, and, although rudely severed from all connection with the State, the National Church of Ireland.

But now the question arises, so far as Ireland is concerned: Were the advisers of Queen Elizabeth, and those of her immediate successors, anxious to promote pure and Scriptural religion among the Irish people, or was their object simply to advance English interests? No other answer than this can be given. The responsible Ministers of the Crown in England were anxious to consolidate their rule in Ireland, and they used the Church, whenever they could do so, as a tool to further their own ends. "But the weapon they chose"—to quote the words of Dean Macartney—"was a fearful one, and it recoiled upon themselves. Popery, Mohammedanism, Buddhism," he says truly, "any form of falsehood, from the worship of the monkey to the abstractions of philosophic Deism, may be made, and has been made with impunity, the tool of the tyrant or of the demagogue, but God's own truth may *not* thus be played with."

Religion was at a very low ebb in Ireland during the forty-four years which comprised the reign of Queen Elizabeth. We confess it with shame and sorrow; but we must confess it. We *must* speak the truth at all risks.

The principles which persecution never would have rooted out were suffered to decay, and almost to die away altogether, by the indolent clergy of these unhappy days. Eminent and zealous men there were in Ireland, of course; but they were comparatively few in number. Most of the clergy were careless about their duties; utterly indifferent to the spiritual welfare of their flocks; unacquainted with the language of the people; English in their feelings; English in their prejudices; completely wanting in sympathy towards those to whom they ministered in spiritual things. Not a few of them lived in England, and spent in England the revenues which they derived from their benefices in Ireland. In all this they were, alas! encouraged by their Bishops. It was not without reason that Dean Swift (and his character was not, by any means, an exemplary one) afterwards said, in the language of deep scorn, that the men who were sent over to fill the Irish Sees by the English Government were invariably robbed of their Letters Patent by the highwaymen on Hounslow Heath, and that the highwaymen came over and personated them. It was this deplorable indolence and rapacity of the Irish Bishops and clergy that was the cause of the disastrous failure which we now

mourn over, and which lay at the bottom of all the misfortunes of this unhappy country. In this sad fact lies the explanation of the present religious condition of Ireland. The sins of the fathers have been visited on the children. We see now very clearly the consequences of this unpardonable neglect on the part of those who went before us. In England and Scotland, the history of the Reformation is the history of the past. In Ireland, the work of the Reformation has yet to be done. It is the work which demands our special attention now, and which will require all our energy for very many years to come. "The Church is strong," as Archbishop Trench said, some years ago, in a Charge to the Dublin Clergy, "in the fact that the great English people, despite all the disappointments of the past, are not prepared finally and for ever to resign the hope that the Reformation, source of countless blessings to England, shall yet be accepted by the whole Irish people, and that, through it, they shall be partakers of the same."

In proof of the foregoing statement, that the work of preaching the Gospel in Ireland was fearfully neglected by the bishops and clergy of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, let me quote here a portion of a letter written to the queen in 1576, by Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy of Ireland. The letter will be found in Bishop Mant's History.

Sir Henry says:—"The lamentable estate of the most noble and principal limb thereof, the Church I mean, as foul, deformed, and cruelly crushed, as any

other part thereof by your only gracious and religious order to be cured, or at least amended, I would not have believed had I not for a great part viewed the same throughout the whole Realm; and was advertised of the particular estate of each church in the Bishopric of Meath, being the best inhabited country of all this Realm, by the honest, zealous, and learned Bishop of the same, Mr. Hugh Brady, a godly minister of the Gospel, and a good servant of Your Highness, who went from church to church himself, and found that there are within his Diocese 224 Parish Churches, of which number 105 are impropriated to sundry possessions now of Your Highness, and now leased out for years, or in fee-farm to several farmers, and great gain reaped out of them above the rent, which Your Majesty received: no parson or vicar resident upon any of them, and a very simple or sorry curate for the most part appointed to serve them; among which number of curates only 18 were found able to speak English, the rest Irish priests, or rather Irish rogues, having very little Latin, less learning or civility. . . . . In many places the very walls of the churches down; very few chancels covered, windows and doors ruined or spoiled. There are 52 Parish Churches in the same Diocese, who have vicars endowed upon them, better served and maintained than the other, yet but badly. There are 52 Parish Churches more, residue of the first number of 224, which pertain to divers particular Lords; and these, though in better estate than the rest commonly are, yet far from well.

"If this be the estate of the Church in the best-peopled diocese and best-governed country of this your Realm, as in truth it is, easy it is for your Majesty to conjecture in what case the rest is, where little or no reformation, either of religion or manners, hath yet been planted and continued among them; yea, so profane and heathenish are some parts of this your country become, as it hath been preached publicly before me, that the Sacrament of Baptism is not used among them, and I truly believe it.

"If I should write unto Your Majesty what spoil hath been and is, of the Archbishoprics, of which there are four, and of the Bishoprics, whereof there are above thirty, partly by the prelates themselves, partly by the potentates, their noisome neighbours, I should make too long a libel of this my letter. But Your Majesty may believe it that upon the face of the earth, where Christ is professed, there is not a Church in so miserable a case; the misery of which consisteth in these three particulars: *the ruin of the very temples themselves; the want of good ministers to serve in them when they shall be re-edified;* and *competent living for the ministers being well chosen.*"

A more melancholy picture than this could hardly have been drawn; and, unhappily, although it refers mainly to the Diocese of Meath, the writer of it hints plainly enough that it may be taken as an accurate description of the Church as it was in his day, all over Ireland.

We now come to a crisis in the history of the Church of Ireland.

The queen's supremacy, like that of her Royal father, having been established and accepted by a large number of her subjects, an Act of Uniformity was passed which enjoined that all ministers should use the Liturgy as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

Strange to say, however, a step was taken in connection with this Act which could only have been taken by a Parliament composed of men who had signally failed to understand the Irish question of their day.

The following clause was inserted in the Act:—"And forasmuch as in most places of this Realm, there cannot be found English ministers to serve in the Churches, or places appointed for Common Prayer, or to minister the Sacraments to the people; and that if some good men were provided, that they might use the Prayer, Service, and Administration of the Sacraments, set out and established by this Act, in such language as they might best understand, the due honour of God should be thereby much advanced, and for that also, that the same may not be in their native language, as well for difficulty to get it printed as that few in the whole Realm can read the Irish letters; we do, therefore, most humbly beseech Your Majesty that with Your Highness' favour and Royal assent it may be enacted, ordained, established, and provided, by the authority of this present Parliament,

that in every such Church or place where the common minister or priest hath not the use or knowledge of the English tongue, it shall be lawful for the same common minister or priest to say and use the Matins, Evensong, and Celebration of the Lord's Supper, and Administration of each of the Sacraments, and all their common and open prayer, IN THE LATIN TONGUE."

The force of folly could scarcely have gone farther than this. English-speaking Irishmen, who were in Holy Orders, were not easily obtained; and, moreover, there were some difficulties to be overcome by those who desired to have the Prayer Book and the Bible printed in the Irish or Celtic character. The problem is, therefore, solved, the Gordian knot is cut through, by ministering to the people in *Latin*. That was the very language in which the Roman Mass was always said. It was a language which, of course, was unintelligible, and which is still unintelligible, to the Irish peasant. But what we are concerned with at this epoch in the history of our Church is the dense ignorance, the want of common sense, of the legislators who submitted such an enactment to Queen Elizabeth, and of the queen herself who gave the enactment her Royal assent. The reasoning of these wise lawgivers amounts to this:—You Irish peasants do not understand English; we cannot get any one to teach you the truths of the Christian Religion in Irish, neither can we be at the pains to get types in which to print Irish books; but be of

good cheer; we shall take good care not to neglect you altogether. If you will only go to Church as dutiful subjects of Her Majesty, you shall hear the Bible and the Liturgy read to you every Sunday in *Latin*.

If Shakspeare, the great dramatic poet of Elizabeth's reign, had had this circumstance present to his mind when he wrote the words which he puts into the mouth of Brutus in his *Julius Cæsar*, he could not have more exactly hit off the condition of affairs in Ireland, both ecclesiastical and political. He says—

> "There is a tide in the affairs of men
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

It is not at all likely that Shakspeare was thinking of the Irish Act of Uniformity when he wrote these words; but in his inimitable way he has stated a great truth which is in every respect applicable to the period of which I am writing.

Queen Elizabeth and her ministers in their dealings with the Irish people failed to take the tide "at the flood;" and now, after more than three hundred years of turmoil, we find ourselves still "bound in shallows and in miseries." We are suffering now because of the intense stupidity of our ancestors, and we may well describe our position in the words of

the same great genius—words which immediately follow those which I have quoted above :

> "On such a full sea are we now afloat;
> And we must take the current when it serves,
> Or lose our ventures."

## CHAPTER IV.

### HOSTILE CAMPS.

WHATEVER may have been the faults of Queen Elizabeth, and however grave the defects of the system which she adopted for the government of Ireland, she certainly conferred on this country one great and signal benefit. In the year 1591 she founded the University of Dublin; and the world hardly needs to be told that some of the greatest men who have ever lived have had their latent powers developed, have been in the highest sense of the word *educated*, within the walls of "Old Trinity," which in the days of Queen Bess stood "near Dublin." "On the 3rd March, 1591, a College was incorporated by Charter or Letters Patent as the Mother of an University, under the style and title of 'The College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, near Dublin.' The object of the foundation of the Society is stated in the Charter to be 'for the education, training, and instruction of youths and students, that they may be the better assisted in the study of the liberal arts, and in the cultivation of virtue and religion. Since that period several Royal Charters have been granted by succeeding sovereigns extending the privileges of

the University, and making such alterations in the Statutes and Constitution of Trinity College as were from time to time deemed necessary."*

The Church of Ireland has, in an especial manner, benefited by the advantages held out to diligent and talented students in Trinity College. No country in Christendom can boast of a more illustrious succession of scholars and divines, reaching down to the present moment, who have upheld, in the midst of great difficulties, the standard of the Christian Faith in Ireland. These men derived their earliest inspiration from the lessons learned in Trinity College, Dublin; and then, entering the sacred ministry of the Church, they taught those lessons to their parishioners in remote country towns, in obscure villages, and in hamlets far from the busy haunts of men. These men have given the Church of Ireland all the *éclat* and all the spiritual influence which she undoubtedly possesses now. When the Church of this country ceases to draw the main body of her clergy from the ranks of the graduates of our ancient University, and is content with the ministry of men, however estimable, who possess little or no general culture, she will be overthrown by the artful devices of shallow-minded sceptics and noisy upholders of "science falsely so called."

On the 24th March, 1603, Queen Elizabeth died; and her long reign was productive of less religious

* Introduction to *Dublin University Calendar*.

improvement in her Irish dominions, and of less accession to the well-being of the Church of Ireland, than might have been expected from her strong Protestant prepossessions, and from the innate force of her character. "Her vigour," says Hume, "her constancy, her magnanimity, her penetration, vigilance, address, are allowed to merit the highest praises, and appear not to have been surpassed by any person that ever filled a throne; a conduct less vigorous, less imperious, more sincere, more indulgent to her people, would have been requisite to form a perfect character. By the force of her mind she controlled all her more active and stronger qualities, and prevented them from running into excess. Her heroism was exempt from temerity, her frugality from avarice, her friendship from partiality, her active temper from turbulency and a vain ambition."

One cannot help wishing that some of these admirable traits in her character had been displayed in her treatment of her Irish subjects. There was, however, one great advantage enjoyed by Irish Protestants during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It was this: that the work of Reformation was sanctioned and carried on by those who had authority in the Church. "They enjoyed," the Rev. Robert King tells us, "the sanction and co-operation of their Prelates, for when the Pope's jurisdiction was renounced, and the work of the Reformation was established by the enactment of the Parliament of 1560, TWO *only out of* NINETEEN

*of the Irish Bishops who were present refused to sanction this enactment.* These two were Walsh, Bishop of Meath, and Leverous, Bishop of Kildare, both of whom refused to take the oath of supremacy. They were in consequence deprived of their bishoprics. . . . . With the exception of these two individuals, all the Irish Bishops of that time remained in their respective Sees, and from them the present orthodox or Protestant Bishops have derived their Orders, being the true and unquestionable successors of the Ancient Irish Church."

Elizabeth was the last Tudor monarch of England. James I. was a Stuart; the great-grandson of Margaret, elder daughter of Henry VII. Elizabeth, with her dying breath, had recognised his title to the throne. It might have been expected that James I. would inherit the Popish predilections of his unhappy mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, but he stood before the world in the attitude of an uncompromising Protestant.

Dr. Robertson, in his *History of Scotland*, tells us that "though Elizabeth would never permit the question concerning the right of succession to the Crown to be determined in Parliament; nor declare her own sentiments concerning a point which she wished to remain an impenetrable mystery; she had, however, formed no design of excluding the Scottish king from an inheritance to which his title was undoubted. A short time before her death she broke the silence which she had so long preserved on that

subject, and told Cecil and the Lord Admiral, 'that her throne was the throne of kings; that she would have no mean person to ascend it, and that her cousin, the King of Scots, should be her successor.' This she confirmed on her death-bed." . . . . . "As his" (the king's) "presence was absolutely necessary in England, where the people were extremely impatient to see their new Sovereign, he prepared to set out for that kingdom without delay. . . . . On the Sunday before his departure he repaired to the Church of St. Giles, and after hearing a sermon in which the preacher displayed the greatness of the Divine Goodness in raising him to the throne of such a powerful kingdom without opposition or bloodshed, and exhorted him to express his gratitude, by promoting to the utmost the happiness and prosperity of his subjects; the king rose up, and addressing himself to the people, made many professions of unalterable attachment towards them; promised to visit Scotland frequently; assured them that his Scottish subjects, notwithstanding his absence, should feel that he was their native Prince no less than when he resided among them; and might still trust that his ears should be always open to their petitions, which he would answer with the alacrity and love of a parent. His words were often interrupted by the tears of the whole audience, who, while they exulted at the king's prosperity, were melted into sorrow by these tender declarations."

It can hardly be said that James I. fulfilled the

expectations which were formed of him when he succeeded to the throne. Dr. Warner, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, says of him that he was "naturally mild, humane, and affable, without affectation, easy of access, and without pride or cruelty. . . . . As to his religion, he may be said to be neither Papist nor Protestant. It was a motley faith, peculiar, I believe, to himself. Properly speaking, James had no other religion than what flowed from a principle which he called kingcraft."

Bishop Burnet, on a review of his character, says:—"It is certain no king could die less lamented or less esteemed than he was. His reign in England was a continued course of mean practices. The great figure the Crown had made in Queen Elizabeth's time, who had rendered herself the arbiter of Christendom, and was the wonder of the age, was so much eclipsed, if not quite darkened, during this reign, that King James was become the scorn of the age; and while hungry writers flattered him out of measure at home, he was despised by all abroad, as a pedant without true judgment, courage, or steadiness, subject to his favourites, and delivered up to the councils, or rather corruptions, of Spain."

The Royal family of the Stuarts, from whom James I. was descended, was partly of Irish blood, and the Sovereign himself was not only of Irish extraction, but he was of the Royal line, and he was entitled by Irish law to be King of Ireland: and so, the jealousy which the Irish people felt at the power

exercised over them by England, it was hoped, would be allayed by the consideration that now they had become the subjects of their rightful hereditary king.

The state of the country, too, was favourable to tranquillity. The great lords had submitted everywhere to Royal authority, and the number of native Irish had been diminished by unsuccessful rebellions. Many were miserably poor, and utterly incapable of offering any resistance to the Government, even if they had been inclined to do so.

Some restless spirits, however, determined to give the king as much trouble as possible. It was the custom in those days to obtain from the Universities of Europe decisions on controverted questions in law or divinity. Cranmer had adopted this course when the legality of the marriage of Henry VIII. and Catherine of Arragon was under discussion. This question was, therefore, submitted to the Universities of Salamanca and Valladolid in Spain—Is it lawful for "Catholics" to obey a Protestant Monarch? As might have been expected, both the Universities replied—"No; it is not:" and advantage was at once taken of this reply to rouse a rebellious spirit among the people. Disturbances took place in Cork, Waterford, Clonmel, Wexford, Limerick, and Kilkenny; but they were soon put down with a high hand, and order was restored. The year after the king's accession (1604), Sir Arthur Chichester was sworn in as Lord Deputy of Ireland, and he held the reins of Government firmly.

Up to this time Roman Catholics, in large numbers, had attended the services of the Church of Ireland; they were known throughout the country as "Church Papists." The Jesuits, however, soon interfered to prevent this, and one can hardly blame them for doing so. But they went much further than this. They actually took upon themselves to meddle with the administration of justice in the Courts of Law, "reviewing," Bishop Mant says, "and deciding causes which had been determined in the King's Courts, and compelling their subjects, *on pain of damnation*, to obey *their* decisions, and not those of the Law."

Acting under the influence of these Jesuits, the people took possession of a number of the Parish Churches, and erected besides in several places Abbeys and Monasteries. Among the churches seized were those of Multifarnham (Westmeath), Kilconnell (Galway), Rossariell (Mayo), Buttevant, Kilkrea, and Timoleague (Cork), Quin (Clare), and the churches of the cities of Waterford and Kilkenny. The object of the seizure, it was said, was to "restore the splendour of religion."

At last Government was compelled to interfere. The remedy applied was a very severe one, but not more so than the circumstances of the case appeared to justify. A Proclamation was issued on the 4th July, 1605, commanding "all Popish Priests to leave the Kingdom before the following 16th December, unless they would conform to the laws of the land."

The Proclamation, however, was not enforced. Roman Catholics were encouraged to offer resistance by a Bull of Pope Paul V. (Camille Borghese), dated 7th December, 1605. This Bull contained "an exhortation and remission to the Catholics of Ireland," declaring it to be as safe to offer sacrifice to idols as to be present at the Common Prayer. It also promised a great force of Romans, Germans, and Spanish by next harvest, and a great store of arms to enable the people to set the Royal authority at defiance.

One person only, Robert Lalor, Vicar-General (so-called) of Dublin and other dioceses in the Province of Leinster, was apprehended for disobeying the King's Proclamation. He was indicted under the Statute 2 Eliz., c. 1, for "advancing and upholding foreign jurisdiction within this Realm." He submitted, and made recognition of the king's authority *on oath*. He was then allowed some liberty, and his friends were permitted to have free access to him. He certainly would have been liberated next term, had he not *privately* repudiated what he had publicly sworn, on the ground that the king's authority extended only to temporal, not to spiritual, causes. It was a clear case of what the Jesuits call "mental reservation." The next step taken was to try him under the Statute of Præmunire, 16 Richard II., c. 5. He was found guilty. Sentence was passed upon him, but it was never carried out. What ultimately became of him we are not told.

The very year that the Proclamation mentioned

above was issued the Gunpowder Plot was discovered. Every one knows the history of this atrocious conspiracy, which, if it had been successful, would have thrown the whole administration of religious and political affairs, for a time at least, into the hands of the Roman Catholic party. The Plot, however, recoiled mercilessly on its authors. Everywhere Popery came to be regarded as synonymous with disloyalty to the Crown.

Nearly twenty years after, in 1622, the whole Province of Ulster, by a remarkable series of incidents, became a stronghold of Protestantism, and of devotion to the reigning monarch. Ulster had gradually fallen into the possession of the Crown by the attainder of rebels.* A company was therefore formed in London for the purpose of planting new colonies in that part of Ireland. It was called the "Irish Society." I need hardly say that this must not be confounded with a Society which bears the same name, and which was founded early in the present century, for the purpose of promoting the Scriptural Education of the Roman Catholics, chiefly through the medium of the Irish language. The Directors of the Irish Society, of which I am now speaking, were wealthy merchants, who were connected with the various guilds for which the City of London is so celebrated. The property in Ulster was divided into small shares, the largest not

* A large area of land, consisting of 511,465 acres of Irish or Plantation measure, equal to 818,344 acres of English or Statute measure, was forfeited to the Crown.

exceeding 2,000 acres. Tenants were brought over from England and Scotland. The Scotch tenants were, of course, for the most part Presbyterians. The Irish were removed from the hills and fastnesses, and settled in the open country; they were taught agriculture, of which they knew very little; they were compelled to obey the law; and before long, Ulster, which had been the most wild, uncivilized, and disorderly province in Ireland, became the most peaceable, loyal, and well cultivated. It has continued so ever since. At this moment it forms a striking contrast to the turbulent and ever-restless provinces of the South and West. In some respects Ulster is superior even to Leinster, with all its advantages. In commercial activity and in population, Belfast is fast outstripping Dublin. Among the advantages which Ulster derived from the "Settlement" of James I., was that of grants of Church lands for the support of the clergy. These were recently dealt with under the provisions of the Irish Church Act (1869).

It was during the reign of James I., and under his sanction and patronage, that our "Authorized Version" of the Holy Scriptures was produced. The Dedication, written by the Translators, is, we must confess, rather fulsome in its flattery of "the Most High and Mighty Prince James;" but there is one sentence in it which we cannot read without a feeling of deep thankfulness. It is this: "Among all our joys, there was no one that more filled our hearts,

than the blessed continuance of the preaching of God's Sacred Word among us; which is that inestimable treasure which excelleth all the riches of the earth; because the fruit thereof extendeth itself, not only to the time spent in this transitory world, but directeth and disposeth men unto that eternal happiness which is above in heaven."

Every effort was made during the reign of King James I. to impart this "inestimable treasure" to the people of Ireland. So far as the dwellers within the "Pale" were concerned, these efforts were attended with a considerable amount of success; but outside, especially among the Irish-speaking people, the condition of affairs was truly deplorable.

After all the grants which were made in 1622 in the Northern Counties of Ireland, it would appear that there were in seven Dioceses of which returns were furnished to the king's ministers, 304 churches in good repair, and 481 in ruins. Under the head of "good repair," are included buildings covered with thatch, the churches being three times as numerous on the whole as the glebes. When the people were blamed for taking their children to the Roman Catholic clergy to be baptized, their excuse invariably was that they had "no curate of their own religion near to them." But not only was there an insufficient supply of clergy. Many of those who filled the position of parish ministers were very poor and very ill-educated. "The incumbents," says Sir John Davis, Attorney-General, "both parsons and

vicars, did appear to be such poor, ragged, ignorant creatures, as we could not esteem any of them worthy of the meanest of those livings, albeit many of them are not worth above forty shillings per annum." In Derry, one of the incumbents is described by his diocesan, Bishop Downham, as "an honest man, but no licensed preacher, notwithstanding to catechize and to speak and read Irish, and sufficient for a parish wholly consisting of Irish." He describes another as "an Irishman of mean gifts, having a little Latin and no English, but thought by my predecessor sufficient for a parish consisting wholly of Irish."

One advantage, however, the men referred to in the foregoing quotations certainly possessed. Their general education may have been neglected, but they could speak *Irish* and teach in *Irish*. This very few of the clergy of that time could do, and therefore the people gradually slipped away from the grasp of the Church. Out of sixty clergymen in the diocese of Armagh, only *three* could read Irish; out of fifty-four in Kilmore and Ardagh, only four. In many dioceses it was impossible to find an Irish-speaking parson.

During a visitation of the Counties of Monaghan, Fermanagh, and Cavan, undertaken by the Lord Deputy and the Attorney-General, it appeared that the churches were for the most part utterly waste; that the king was the patron of all the livings; and that many of the incumbents were Roman Catholic

priests, instituted by bishops deriving their authority from Rome, yet many of them, like other old priests of Queen Mary's time in England, "ready to yield to conformity."

The bishops were not better than the clergy over whom they were placed. Bishop George Mountgomery, a Scotchman, and Dean of Norwich, was appointed Bishop of Derry, Raphoe, and Clogher. Two years after his appointment, he was still in England, and was not even thinking of coming over to look after his three dioceses. Notwithstanding this shameful neglect, he was allowed, on resigning Derry and Raphoe, to retain the bishopric of Clogher with that of Meath, and also his Deanery of Norwich. He died in 1620.

We cannot help coming to the conclusion, that during the whole of this reign the Church of Ireland was fearfully neglected by those who were placed in authority over her. Her members were left in a condition of lamentable destitution, as to the means of assembling for public worship and instruction, or of receiving the aid of pastoral guidance for themselves or their children. The country districts especially presented a picture of misery and desolation. There was really no attempt made by the Church, as a Church, for the instruction of the people through the means of the Irish language. There were some exertions put forth, it is true, by individual incumbents or curates, but these were feeble efforts after all; and they were completely baffled, as might have

been expected, by the activity of Roman Catholic priests. No effort worthy of the name was made during the reign of James I. to instruct the people in the truths of the Reformation, to bring them back to the faith professed by St. Patrick.

"The Irish," says Lord Macaulay, "were the only people of northern Europe who had remained true to the old religion." This is partly to be ascribed to the circumstance that they were some centuries behind their neighbours in knowledge. But other causes had co-operated. The Reformation had been a national, as well as a moral, revolt. It had been not only an insurrection of the laity against the clergy, but also an insurrection of all the branches of the great German race against an alien domination. It is a most significant circumstance that no large society of which the tongue is not Teutonic has ever turned Protestant, and that wherever a language derived from ancient Rome is spoken, the religion of modern Rome to this day prevails. The patriotism of the Irish had taken a peculiar direction. The object of their animosity was not Rome but *England;* and they had especial reason to abhor those English sovereigns who had been the chiefs of the great schism, Henry the Eighth and Elizabeth. During the vain struggle which two generations of Milesian princes maintained against the Tudors, religious enthusiasm and national enthusiasm became inseparably blended in the minds of the vanquished race. The new feud of Protestant and Papist in-

flamed the old feud of Saxon and Celt. The English conquerors meanwhile neglected all legitimate means of conversion. No care was taken to provide the vanquished nation with *instructors capable of making themselves understood. No translation of the Bible was put forth in the Erse language.* The Government contented itself with setting up a vast hierarchy of Protestant Archbishops, Bishops, and Rectors, who did nothing, and who, for doing nothing, were paid out of the spoils of a Church loved and revered by the great body of the people." Some allowance must be made here for Lord Macaulay's Whig and Dissenting proclivities; but, after all, candour compels us to acknowledge that his indictment, in its main points, has been sustained by clear and incontrovertible evidence.

In 1625 James I. died, and was succeeded by his only son, the unhappy Charles I. Throughout the greater part of this reign we find the Church of Ireland utterly neglected; and we hear the same old story of ruined churches, ignorant clergymen, and rapacious prelates.

There were, however, some very bright exceptions. Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Bedel shed a lustre upon the Church which would have enlightened the whole land if their lives had been prolonged.

James Ussher was appointed to the Bishopric of Meath in 1620, and was raised to the Primacy in 1625. His diligence in study enabled him to acquire an extraordinary degree of learning; and he

was as remarkable for his piety as for his tolerant spirit. He visited England shortly before the Rebellion of 1641, and never returned. He died in England in 1655.

William Bedel was a native of Essex. In 1593 he became a Fellow of Emanuel College, Cambridge; and graduated B.D. in 1599. He is said to have possessed a singular knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He filled for some time the office of Chaplain to Sir Henry Wotton, Ambassador in Venice, and the intimate friend of Father Paul Sarpi, who wrote the *History of the Council of Trent*. He was appointed in 1627 Provost of Trinity College; and consecrated Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh in St. Peter's Church, Drogheda, February 7th, 1641. Izaak Walton, the author of that quaint old book, *The Complete Angler*, wrote, among other lives, that of Sir Henry Wotton. He says:—"Sir Henry having, after some short time and consideration, resolved upon Venice, and a large allowance being appointed by the king for his voyage thither, and a settled maintenance during his stay there; he left England, nobly accompanied through France to Venice, by gentlemen of the best families and breeding that this nation afforded: they were too many to name; but these two may not be omitted, Sir Albertus Morton, his nephew, who went as his Secretary; and *William Bedel*, a man of choice learning and sanctified wisdom, who went as his Chaplain."

Ussher and Bedel lived in troublous times. Both England and Ireland, during the reign of Charles I., had to endure all the horrors of Civil War. Lord Macaulay, in his Essay on Milton, throws the whole blame of the war on the king, whom he denounces in language so severe that it can only be accounted for by remembering that Lord Macaulay was a very violent political partisan, and, although he must take rank as one of the most brilliant writers of the nineteenth century, he was sadly deficient in that calmness of judgment and impartiality which are required in a historian. He says of Charles I.:—"We cannot, in estimating the character of an individual, leave out of our consideration his conduct in the most important of all human relations; and if, in that relation, we find him to have been selfish, cruel, and deceitful, we shall take the liberty to call him a bad man, in spite of all his temperance at table, and his regularity at chapel." *The Eikon Basilike, or Portraiture of His Majesty King Charles I.*, goes very far to prove that Lord Macaulay was utterly wrong in his estimate of the king's character. This remarkable book, which there can be little doubt was written by the king himself, was published in 1648, and passed through fifty editions the first year. A reprint has recently appeared (1879), from which I shall give an extract or two when I come to speak presently of the rebellion in Ireland.

Let me, first, however refer to the important services which were rendered to the Church of Ireland

during this reign by two men whose characters have been grossly misrepresented in nearly all our modern popular Histories of England, Archbishop Laud and Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. These men were persecuted, imprisoned, and finally beheaded, because they manfully upheld Episcopacy and Monarchy against Puritanism and Republicanism; and the only real blot on the character of Charles I. is this, that he weakly sacrificed them to popular clamour, and gratified their enemies by signing the warrants for their execution.

Spoliation, sacrilege, and criminal neglect had, as I have already said, left the Church of Ireland in a most miserable condition. The attention of Archbishop Laud was called to this lamentable state of affairs by Bishop Bedel, and on the suggestion of Primate Ussher, Archbishop Laud resolved to obtain, if possible, from the king a restitution of all the Irish impropriations which had been granted by the Crown to laymen. The time was very unpromising for such a step as this. The Exchequer was nearly empty, and the necessities of the king were urgent. But the king, at once, assented to the proposal. The plan was energetically carried out by Lord Deputy Wentworth, and thus the Church recovered a considerable portion of her revenues. The Lord Deputy said in one of his letters: "Just at this present, I am informed that My Lord Clanricarde hath engrossed as many parsonages and vicarages as he hath mortgaged for £4000, and £80 rent. But, in faith, have

at him, and all the rest of the *Ravens*. If I spare a man of them, let no man ever spare me. Howbeit, I foresee, this is so universal a disease that I shall incur a number of men's displeasure, of the best rank among them. But were I not better lose these, for God Almighty's cause, than lose Him for theirs?"

I have made the foregoing statement on the authority of the Rev. C. W. Le Bas, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor in the East India College, Herts, who, fifty years ago, published a Life of Archbishop Laud, which bears upon its pages the impress of truth, and which gives a view of the Archbishop's actions and opinions very different from those which are currently believed among us. One fact is undoubted, that the Church of Ireland owes a debt of gratitude to both Laud and Wentworth for their praiseworthy exertions in her behalf, at a time when she was trodden under foot by her enemies, or neglected by those who called themselves her friends.

"It is almost needless to state that this," says Mr. Le Bas, "like almost every other public act of Laud, was afterwards voted to be *traitorous*. It was said to intimate a design for the abolition of *all* impropriations, and, therefore, was evidence of a desire to usurp no less than a Papal power; and it was treasonable to the king, inasmuch as it amounted to a *robbing of the Crown*."

Archbishop Laud stated that although the proposition had originated from himself, it had been

explained to the officers of the Exchequer. The matter had been patiently considered; and the free consent of the king had been obtained. There was, therefore, no "robbing of the Crown." But then, says Laud, "The increase of Popery is complained of in Ireland. Is there a better way to hinder this growth than to place an able clergy among the inhabitants? Can an able clergy be had without means? Is any means fitter than impropriations restored? My Lords, I did this as holding it the best means to keep down Popery, and to advance the Protestant religion. And I wish, with all my heart, I had been able to do it sooner, before so many impropriations were gotten from the Crown *into private hands.*"

In September, 1633, the connexion between the Archbishop and the Church of Ireland had become more intimate than it had been before, in consequence of his election to the Chancellorship of the University of Dublin. It appears from his correspondence with the Lord Deputy that he had accepted this honour with great reluctance. He wished that the Lord Deputy should himself occupy that important post, on the ground that his commanding influence, and his presence on the spot, would render him the most effectual guardian of that learned body; but when his election had actually taken place, he applied himself with great vigour to the new duties which had been cast upon him, and eventually he procured for Trinity College a new Charter, together with a Code of Statutes for its better government. He also

felt himself engaged by his closer relation to the University to a more vigilant care for the honour and the efficiency of the Church of Ireland.

The College Calendar thus refers to Archbishop Laud in the List of the Chancellors of the University: "1633. William Laud, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Educated at St. John's College, Oxford, of which he was elected a Fellow in 1593, and President, 1611; Archdeacon of Huntingdon, 1615; Dean of Gloucester, 1616; Prebendary of Westminster, 1620; Bishop of St. David's, 1621; translated to Bath and Wells, 1626; London, 1628; Canterbury, 1633; elected Chancellor, Sept. 14th, 1633. The Code of Statutes of Charles I., at present (for the most part) in force in the University, was drawn up, under the king's order, by his direction, and each page of the parchment volume is signed by him. He was beheaded by order of the Long Parliament, Jan. 10th, 1644-5, in the seventy-second year of his age."

"Articles of Religion" had been adopted by the Church of Ireland in the Convocation which had been held during the reign of James I., in 1615. These Articles, however, in many important particulars differed from the Articles which had been adopted by the Church of England in 1562; and the effect of this was, that the two Churches exhibited the spectacle, not of sisterly concord, but of unseemly dissension; and both of them became objects of bitter scorn to the Roman Catholics. It was therefore

of the highest importance to the honour and peace of both, that the Church of Ireland should accept the articles which had been agreed upon in England. There was no difficulty in the way which was not easily overcome. The Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Lord Deputy of Ireland, worked harmoniously together to bring about this arrangement: and at the Convocation held in Dublin in 1634, the English Articles and Canons were received in their full integrity, and the two National Churches were brought into a state of entire conformity with each other. The Articles remain to this day unaltered; but the Canons have been modified of late years, in consequence of the changed position which the Church of Ireland has occupied since the legal bond which united her to the Church of England was severed.

I must now briefly touch upon one of the greatest calamities that has ever befallen Ireland. I do so because it cannot be dissociated altogether from the history of the Church.

In 1641, Roger More, who is described by Hume as "a gentleman of narrow fortune, descended from an ancient Irish family, and celebrated among his countrymen for valour and capacity," formed a resolution to expel all the English from Ireland, and to assert the independence of his native country. He succeeded before long in enlisting the aid of all the principal Irish chieftains; and Sir Phelim O'Neale agreed to head the insurrection in Ulster.

An attempt to take possession of Dublin Castle failed; O'Connolly, an Irish Protestant, having given timely information to the authorities. Before the news of this failure reached Ulster, O'Neale and his fellow-conspirators had raised the standard of rebellion. "The Irish, everywhere, intermingled with the English"—here I quote Hume—"needed but a hint from their leaders and priests to begin hostilities against a people whom they hated on account of their religion, and envied for their riches and prosperity. The houses, cattle, and goods of the unwary English were first seized. Those who heard of the commotions in their neighbourhood, instead of deserting their habitations, and assembling for mutual protection, remained at home, in hopes of defending their property, and fell thus separately into the hands of their enemies. After rapacity had fully exerted itself, cruelty, the most barbarous that ever in any nation was known or heard of, began its operations. *An universal massacre* commenced of the English, now defenceless, and passively resigned to their inhuman foes. No age, no sex, no condition, was spared. The wife, weeping for her butchered husband, and embracing her helpless children, was pierced with them, and perished by the same stroke. The old, the young, the vigorous, the infirm, underwent a like fate, and were confounded in one common ruin. In vain did flight save from the first assault; destruction was, everywhere, let loose, and met the hunted victims at every turn. In vain was recourse

had to relations, to companions, to friends; all connexions were dissolved, and death was dealt by that hand from which protection was implored and expected. Without provocation, without opposition, the astonished English, living in profound peace and full security, were *massacred by their nearest neighbours*, with whom they had long upheld a continual intercourse of kindness and good offices. But death was the slightest punishment inflicted by those rebels. All the tortures which wanton cruelty could devise, all the lingering pains of body, the anguish of mind, the agonies of despair, could not satiate revenge, excited without injury, and cruelty derived from no cause. To enter into particulars would shock the least delicate humanity. Such enormities, though attested by undoubted evidence, appear almost incredible. Depraved nature, even perverted religion, encouraged by the utmost licence, reach not to such a pitch of ferocity; unless the pity inherent in human breasts be destroyed by that contagion of example which transports men beyond all the usual motives of conduct and behaviour."

These enormities have been "attested by undoubted evidence," and yet, with an audacity to which it would be hard to find a parallel, Mr. A. M. Sullivan, in his *Story of Ireland*, actually denies that any such massacre was ever perpetrated. He says that the "Puritanical Executive in Dublin Castle started the story of an awful, bloody, and altogether tremendous massacre of Protestants. To be sure, they knew

there had been no massacre—quite the contrary; but this made little matter." An easy way, this, of getting rid of a troublesome difficulty.

Charles I., at any rate, believed that his English subjects were ruthlessly massacred in Ireland in the year of grace 1641; for he says in the *Eikon Basilike:* "The commotions in Ireland were so sudden and so violent, that it was hard at first either to discern the rise or apply a remedy to that precipitant rebellion. Indeed that sea of blood which hath there been cruelly and barbarously shed is enough to drown any man in eternal both infamy and misery whom God shall find the malicious author or instigator of its effusion." And again: "When all proportionable succours of the poor Protestants in Ireland (who were daily massacred and overborne with numbers of now desperate enemies) was diverted and obstructed here, I was earnestly entreated and generally advised by the chief of the Protestant party there to get them some respite and breathing by a cessation, without which they saw no probability, unless by a miracle, to preserve the remnant that had yet escaped. God knows with how much commiseration and solicitous caution, I carried on that business by persons of honour and integrity, that so I might neither encourage the rebels' insolence, nor discourage the Protestants' loyalty and patience."

The memory of this frightful, this treacherous, this diabolical slaughter of unoffending Protestants still lingers in many parts of Ulster; and gives rise to

what is erroneously called "party feeling." It is not mere political or even religious party feeling. It is much more than that. It is a deep-rooted and dismal hatred of treachery, accompanied with a fierce resolution that no opportunity shall ever again be given for the perpetration of such wickedness. If Ulster Protestants exhibit their dislike to Popery in a very decided manner, and if they sometimes say that they cannot trust their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, we shall find it very hard indeed to blame them so long as they have the picture of the sanguinary deeds of 1641 present to their minds.

It was this awful crime that Oliver Cromwell avenged in 1649, the very year that Charles I. was beheaded.

When Cromwell found himself at the head of an army of sturdy, hard-headed Protestant Republicans, he determined to teach Irish rebels a lesson which they would never forget. I must confess that I am no admirer of Cromwell. Even Thomas Carlyle, with his self-sufficient assertions, and his barbarous English jargon, has not convinced the world that Cromwell was either a great or a good man. But Cromwell was determined, obstinate, and not easily turned aside from his purpose, whatever that purpose might be. He had determined to punish the aiders and abettors of Roger More and Phelim O'Neale, and he stopped at nothing. He struck down right and left those whom he considered to be the enemies of God and of religion; he left the marks of his dire

vengeance on Drogheda, on Wexford, on Clonmel, on Kilkenny, and on other towns of importance. He committed many excesses, no doubt. He transported thousands from the fertile plains of Tipperary to the desolate wildernesses of Clare and Mayo, giving them their choice between "Connaught and Hell." He drove vast numbers of Irish peasants into foreign countries, caring very little whether they lived or died; and whilst it is impossible to express approval of such merciless severity as this, it is equally impossible to deny that the provocation which both English and Irish Protestants had received was great almost beyond endurance. When Cromwell went to Drogheda, and took it by storm, he gave no quarter; and he justified his cruelty in a letter to the Hon. William Lenthall, Speaker of the Parliament of England, in these words: "I am persuaded this is a righteous judgment of God upon the barbarous wretches who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood; and that it will but tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future, which are the satisfactory grounds for such actions, which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret."

Cromwell certainly saved Ireland for the English Government, and he prevented the utter extinction of Protestantism in this land; so that we need not feel much surprised at hearing, as we do sometimes in the West of Ireland, the malediction of the Irish Roman Catholic peasant, accompanying a scowl of fierce anger, uttered deliberately in these words—

"The curse of Cromwell rest upon you." If Cromwell had not unsheathed his sword, and made the law respected, a second massacre would have completed the work which the first had left unfinished. The Church of Ireland, as well as her Presbyterian ally in the North, would have perished beneath the murderous assaults of the assassins; and Romanism would have been triumphant from Rathlin Island to Cape Clear.

It was, however, Protestantism in the abstract, not that form of Protestantism upheld by the Church of Ireland, which Cromwell favoured.

When Dublin surrendered to the Parliamentary Commissioners, Cromwell determined to make the Church feel and acknowledge his power. On June 24th, 1647, he issued an order for the discontinuance of the Liturgy in Public Worship. The Directory, drawn up by a Committee of English Dissenters, was to take its place. The clergy of Dublin thereupon drew up a Declaration, in which they stated that it was impossible for them to comply with this demand. They pleaded—(1) their Ordination vows; (2) the Oath of Supremacy; (3) the Act of Uniformity; (4) their independence as the Clergy of the Church of Ireland, which, although in agreement with, was, nevertheless, distinct from the Church of England; (5) the command of Convocation as contained in the Canons of 1634; and (6) their inability to agree to any change which had not been made with the consent of the whole Church.

"The Reformed Church of Ireland," they said, "is a *free National Church*, and not subordinate to or dependent on the Convocation of any other Church." They added, that the affection of the people for the Prayer Book was so great as to make it very unlikely that they would consent to see it set aside for any other form of worship. The Church of Ireland never had a greater enemy than Oliver Cromwell, the so-called "Protector." During his usurpation, for such it undoubtedly was, bishops were banished from their dioceses, clergymen were driven from their parishes, churches were used as stables for the troopers of the Parliamentary army, and aged pastors, who remained at their posts, and discharged their duty to their flocks, were imprisoned for reading the service which they had solemnly sworn at their ordination to use in public prayer. No wonder that the Roman Catholics of Ireland looked on in astonishment, and clung the more closely to the religion in which they had been brought up.

In 1660 Cromwell died. That he was a man of consummate ability, no one can deny. That his policy was in any way beneficial, either to England or to Ireland, few will venture to assert.

Hume says: "The domestic administration of Cromwell, though it discovers great abilities, was conducted without any plan either of liberty or arbitrary power; perhaps his difficult situation admitted of neither. His foreign enterprises, though full of intrepidity, were pernicious to the national interest,

and seem more the result of impetuous fury or narrow prejudices, than of cool foresight or deliberation." Lord Macaulay, one of his great admirers, says: "While he lived his power stood firm, an object of mingled aversion, admiration, and dread to his subjects. Few indeed loved his government; but those who hated it most, hated it less than they feared it."

I have already said that he saved the Church of Ireland from utter extinction, but he did it in such a way as to leave behind very bitter memories. A firm but gentle policy would have certainly attained the end which he had in view; and would have smoothed down in time all those asperities which from that day to this have made Ireland the battlefield of rival political and religious parties.

## CHAPTER V.

### CHURCH AND STATE.

CHARLES II. was proclaimed king in Dublin, on May 14th, 1660; and one of his first acts was to restore and complete the Episcopate of the Church of Ireland. He was at this time thirty years of age, and possessed of a vigorous constitution, a manly figure, and a graceful air. He was every inch a king. No monarch ever obtained a crown under more favourable circumstances, or was more cordially welcomed by his subjects. He seemed disposed to forget all the injuries which he and his father had suffered at the hands of Cromwell's friends and followers, and anxious to unite all parties in one common bond of patriotism.

How signally he disappointed the expectations which had been formed of him we all know. He sank in the course of a few years into the condition of a mere voluptuary, whilst all public business was transacted by his ministers. "He detested business," Lord Macaulay says, "and would sooner have abdicated his crown than have undergone the trouble of really directing the administration." The witty Duke of Rochester hit off his character very cleverly

in the following lines, which he proposed to place as an epitaph on the king's tombstone in the event of his death :—

> "Here lies our Sovereign Lord the King,
> Whose word no man relies on ;
> Who never *said* a foolish thing,
> And never *did* a wise one."

It will be remembered that when this verse was shown to the king, so far from being angry at what might have appeared to him to be the impertinence of a courtier, he was intensely amused, and remarked :—"His Grace of Rochester is quite right ; for my words are my own, whilst my acts are the acts of my ministers."

One could hardly have expected Charles II. to take an interest in the welfare of the Church of Ireland, or in the progress of true religion. He restored bishops to their Sees because he hated Puritanism, and because he was naturally anxious to undo the mischief that had been done to the Church by Cromwell ; but the condition of Ireland, as regarded church accommodation and the religious instruction of the people, remained very much as it had been during the two preceding reigns.

Such efforts as were made at this time for the spread of religion were made by private individuals without any aid whatever from Government. The Hon. Robert Boyle tried to get the Bible circulated in the Irish language at his own expense. Dr.

Wake, then Archbishop of Canterbury, gave him all the help he could, and so did Bishop Bedel. This good man, of whom I have already made mention, was, at this time, Bishop of Kilmore. When quite advanced in years, he had made himself master of the Irish language, had written an Irish Grammar, and had translated the Old Testament into Irish. The New Testament and the Book of Common Prayer already existed in Irish. All that was wanted, therefore, was that the books should be got into general circulation, and the people taught to use them. This was just what Mr. Boyle tried to do, but with comparatively little success. Here and there attempts were made to establish services in Irish, but owing to the want of Irish-speaking clergymen, these attempts were fitful and uncertain, and generally ended in failure. Nothing was done on any large scale to promote the instruction of the people in the Holy Scriptures. All that could be seen was an occasional gleam of light, not a general illumination of the national mind.

The people in places remote from towns, at any rate, understood no language but Irish. Their hearts and their consciences could not be reached through the medium of English or Latin. If Bishop Bedel had been able to do all that he wished and longed to do, Ireland would now have been, for the most part, Protestant, and the Church of Ireland would have been the Church of the majority of the dwellers in this land. Bishop Mant says of him : " The history

of the whole Church of Christ does not, in all probability, contain a more perfect pattern of a Christian bishop than may be contemplated in the life of Bishop Bedel, as to the care with which he supplied all vacancies within his diocese; the strictness with which he conducted his examinations for Holy Orders; his constant refusal to admit any without a title to a particular flock; his studious observation of the behaviour of his clergy, mixed with paternal tenderness and compassion for their weaknesses; his earnest endeavours in counteracting pluralities, and in prevailing on all to observe parochial residence; and his constant business at his visitations in investigating the state of his Diocese, and in giving good instruction and advice both to the clergy and the laity."

And let me add this. Whilst Bishop Bedel attended to his own clergy, and to the laity of his Diocese, he was not unmindful of the spiritual wants of the Roman Catholics by whom he was surrounded. A striking proof of this was given when at his grave, around which stood multitudes of mourners, a priest of the Roman Church, unrestrained by the presence of many members of his flock, spoke of him as "*ultimus Anglorum;*" and added, "*Sit anima mea cum Bedelio.*"

We have now arrived at a period in the history of both Church and State in Ireland which, so long as the world lasts, must be regarded by all Protestants with feelings of most devout thankfulness to Almighty God.

James II., the brother of Charles II., his equal in duplicity, his superior in talent, was placed on the throne in 1685. In three short years he was hurled from power, and the house of Stuart placed for ever under a ban, so far as the Royal dignity was concerned.

The instant James II. took the reins of government into his own hands, Roman Catholics were put in possession of the Council Table, of the Courts of Judicature, and of the Bench of Magistrates. The charters of Dublin and of all the Corporations were annulled; and new charters were granted, subjecting the Corporations to the will of the Sovereign. Protestant freemen were expelled. Roman Catholics were introduced into their places. The Act of Settlement was the only obstacle to their obtaining possession of all the property throughout the country. Hume tells us distinctly that "Lord Tyrconnel had formed a scheme for calling a Parliament to reverse that Act, and empower the king to bestow all the lands of Ireland on his Catholic subjects."

Protestants in Ireland are sometimes reproached even now with the severity of the penal laws enacted and enforced during the reigns of the first three Georges; but let it never be forgotten that these laws, heavily as they undoubtedly pressed upon our Roman Catholic countrymen, were, after all, merely protective, and therefore quite justifiable. Even in these enlightened days, even in this nineteenth century, can it be doubted by any one who knows

anything of the history of the past, that if it were possible to assert Roman Catholic supremacy in Ireland, it would be utterly impossible for any Protestant to live here with any degree of comfort for twenty-four hours? Romanism and Protestantism are antagonistic forces, and one can only flourish at the expense of the other. In Ireland, Romanism has never exhibited a tolerant spirit; and, therefore, Protestants have been driven, in self-defence, to acts of repression, and sometimes of actual tyranny.

James II. tried to compel his Irish Protestant subjects to submit to his will; but there were other forces at work, the power of which he did not calculate upon, and to which, in the end, he had to submit, not graciously, but ignominiously. In 1688 matters came to a crisis. From his predecessors James II. had inherited two prerogatives, the dispensing power, and ecclesiastical supremacy. By means of the dispensing power he was enabled to admit Roman Catholics, not only to civil and military, but also to spiritual offices; and by means of his ecclesiastical supremacy, he endeavoured to force Popery upon the Church of England. He was authorised by law, he maintained, to repress spiritual abuses, and the first spiritual abuse which he determined to repress was the liberty which the Anglican clergy made use of to defend their own religion, and to attack the doctrines of Rome.

Is it any wonder that, when this rumour got abroad, the Protestant spirit of England, and, in an especial

manner, that of Ireland, was roused into action? From the moment that it appeared quite clear that this was the king's policy, his dethronement, and the assertion of Protestant principles, were determined upon by a large and influential party, both in the Church and in the State.

His own son-in-law was made the instrument of his ruin.

William Henry filled the proud and honourable position of Prince of Orange Nassau. "His name" —I quote Lord Macaulay—"at once calls up before us a slender and feeble frame, a lofty and ample forehead, a nose curved like the beak of an eagle, an eye rivalling that of an eagle in brightness and keenness, a thoughtful and somewhat sullen brow, a firm and somewhat peevish mouth, a cheek pale and thin, and deeply furrowed by sickness and by care. That pensive, severe, and solemn aspect could scarcely have belonged to a happy or a good-humoured man. But it indicated, in a manner not to be mistaken, capacity equal to the most arduous enterprises, and fortitude not to be shaken by reverses or dangers."

In May, 1688, the Prince of Orange was summoned, by the unanimous voice of the Protestants of England and Ireland, to undertake their deliverance from the yoke of Rome, and the tyranny of James II. Nobly he responded to the call. On the 16th October of the same year he took a solemn farewell of the States General of Holland. On the 5th November he reached Torbay; and landing on the next day,

he displayed his banner, on which were inscribed these words:—"THE LIBERTIES OF ENGLAND, AND THE PROTESTANT RELIGION, I WILL MAINTAIN." Then followed, in quick succession, the flight of James II., and the proclamation of William and Mary—February 13th, 1689—as United Sovereigns of this Realm.

In the month of June, 1690, William III., who had long been impatiently expected in Ireland, landed at Carrickfergus; and within a month after his landing he had fought and won the Battle of the Boyne—July 1st, 1690. James II. had returned to make one last desperate effort in defence of his Crown. Before the battle was well over, he fled from the field to Dublin. Thence he started with all haste for the County Wicklow, from which, at sunrise on July 3rd, he reached Waterford. From Waterford he found his way to Kinsale, and after that across the water to Brest. The history of the Stuarts virtually ends here. His son and his grandson tried in a feeble way to retrieve their fallen fortunes, but they signally failed: and the world would long since have forgotten them if the memory of their romantic adventures had not been preserved to us by that great master of romance, Sir Walter Scott.

Eleven days after the Battle of the Boyne, on Sunday, the 12th July, 1690, the battle of Aughrim was fought. General Ginckel, who commanded for King William, completely defeated General St. Ruth, who fought for James II. with a courage worthy of a better cause. The triumph of the Prince of Orange,

of civil and religious liberty, and of Protestantism, was now complete. Nearly two centuries have passed away since then: and at the present moment a million and a half of Protestants in Ireland may thank God for raising up William III. as their deliverer; whilst four millions of Roman Catholics may be equally thankful for the success achieved by the Protestant party at the Boyne and Aughrim.

Roman Catholics in Ireland have long since shared with Protestants all the blessings of freedom. All now equally enjoy the protection of the law, and all have the satisfaction of knowing that they live under the rule of a queen who has endeared herself to her subjects, in every rank of life, by the uprightness of her conduct, by the integrity of her character, by the sympathy which she has always shown for the poor or the afflicted, by her many domestic virtues, and by the wisdom which she has displayed in the management of the affairs of her great Empire. The House of Orange, and subsequently the House of Brunswick, have been the means of raising the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland to the proud position which that kingdom now occupies among the nations of the earth; and all classes of Irishmen have participated in the blessings which have been enjoyed by their English and Scottish fellow-subjects. How different the position of Ireland would have been now, if James II. had proved victorious at the Boyne. The iron rule of Rome would have crushed out all enterprise, would have defeated every attempt to promote

social and intellectual progress, and religion would have been a mere synonym for superstition and priestcraft. That this would have been the fate of Ireland no one can doubt who looks at the present condition of Spain, or who knows what was the condition of "the Kingdom of the two Sicilies" during the reign of the Bourbons. From this intense degradation Ireland was saved by the heroes of 1690, foremost amongst whom must ever stand, William, Prince of Orange.

The political events of the three years of James the Second's reign were disastrous to the Church of Ireland. Archbishop King, when consecrated Bishop of Derry in 1691, found that, in consequence of the ravages to which his Diocese had long been subject, "its villages and plantations were all destroyed; its churches burned or dilapidated; its clergy withdrawn, and its parishes forsaken; the poverty of the people, and the want of tillage and cattle, being insufficient for the support of a resident ministry."

With the accession of William and Mary came a change for the better. Good men and true, in many parts of the country, exerted themselves to do their duty faithfully and diligently in the midst of all the difficulties by which they were surrounded. The truth of God was upheld. The Bible was read and appreciated. The appointments to bishoprics and to parishes were, on the whole, such as would commend themselves to Christians anxious for the advancement of "pure and undefiled religion." There was still

much to create sadness, no doubt, but there was a great deal for which to be thankful. The Church began to be regarded as a religious institution, rather than as a political engine; and the clergy made every effort to extend the influence of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, rather than that of the English Government.

And yet, so far as the native Irish were concerned, matters remained very much as they had been for the previous sixty or seventy years. The Church did not seem to realise at this time the dignity of her position as a National Church; and instead of proclaiming to the world by active work and loving counsels that she was really the Church of Ireland, she was content to be regarded as the Church of England *in* Ireland.

"The public records of the early part of the 18th century," says the Rev. William Fitzpatrick (Clerical Secretary of the Irish Society), in his account of the early attempts to convert the Roman Catholics of Ireland to the Established Religion, "very clearly express the history of the various missionary efforts devised by the State and by the Irish Church at that time." Mr. Fitzpatrick then recounts the proceedings of the Irish Houses of Convocation, as given in the narrative of the Rev. John Richardson, of Belturbet; and on reviewing the whole state of the case, he asks—"What were the results? It would be hazardous," he replies, "for us to venture to assert that there were none, or even that

they were few. It is often impossible for us to trace the connexion between cause and effect. As in the processes of God's government of the natural world, we cannot necessarily trace the special result of the shower that waters the earth, or of the sun that shines, or of the wind that blows, or the limit of the influence of counteracting causes, or the results of a multitude of other causes known or unknown to us, which are in operation and under the control of Him who is the Cause of causes, for some wise purpose, and some beneficent result; so in the operations of the kingdom of grace we cannot pronounce of any action that is in accordance with His will, that it produces no good."

The results at this time, however, were not very clearly visible.

Just as the 18th century dawned, William III. was succeeded by Anne, Princess of Denmark. It cannot be said that during her reign nothing was done for the spread of true religion in Ireland, because we know that strenuous efforts to circulate the Holy Scriptures were made by pious and zealous individuals here and there: and as Mr. Fitzpatrick very properly remarks in the passage which I have given above, we cannot say of "any action that is in accordance with God's will, that it produces no good." But the Church, as a Church, had not yet taken a correct estimate of her Divine mission; and political feuds would have hindered her progress even if she had made any determined effort to move onward.

Bishop Mant says:—"The Statutes passed in the reign of William and Mary, with relation to the Church, testify, on the part of the Government and Legislature, their sense of the dangers from which they had escaped and to which they were still exposed from the unrestricted spirit of Popery. To represent these enactments"—here the Bishop gives the words of Burke, as quoted by Plowden—"as the manifest effects of national hatred and scorn towards a conquered people whom the victors delighted to trample upon, and were not at all afraid to provoke, as calculated to harass and ruin a set of people who were looked upon as enemies to God and man, and, indeed, as a race of bigoted savages who were a disgrace to human nature itself, is language which may be employed for the purposes of a political partisan, but is utterly at variance with the fact. They" (the Statutes) "were calculated, indeed, to promote not only the security of the Protestant, but the benefit of the Papist; especially that which had for its object to counteract the restless intrusion and domineering influence of Popish ecclesiastics. If the prudence which dictated that enactment had been followed up with corresponding wisdom, vigilance, and vigour in its execution, effective provision having been made withal for the ministrations of the clergy in a degree commensurate with the occasion, the deluded victims of a fond superstition might have been weaned from their blind attachment to a foreign religious dictator, and have become, by God's blessing, reasonable and

enlightened members of the Reformed National Church."

Queen Anne's ministers, instead of adopting the wise policy of William III., used such influence as they had for the degradation of the Church of Ireland. On the death, for instance, of Bishop Foy, of Waterford, who appears to have been a good man, the Lord Lieutenant's chaplain, a perfect stranger, who had been only a few months in Ireland, was appointed. Writing about this incident, February 28th, 1708, Archbishop King observes:—"You will not expect from me any account of how it is relished here. Some say that if General Laureston had been Primate, it would not have been so." The Archbishop probably meant that such a disgraceful step would not have been taken in the army; and that if anything of the kind had been done, there would have been a strong protest against it from military men.

When, about the same time, the See of Cork and Ross became vacant, the notoriously profligate Earl of Wharton was anxious to get one of his own favourites appointed; but this case was so very flagrant that the two English Archbishops interfered, and the appointment was not made.*

* Bishop Burnet, in his *Life and Times*, writing of the English gentry of the reign of Queen Anne, says:—"The gentry are not early acquainted with the principles of religion; so that after they have forgot their Catechism, they acquire no more new knowledge, but what they learn in plays

They were, however, not equally successful in their endeavours to keep Dean Swift out of the Irish Church. He was spoken of for the Bishopric of Hereford, but the profaneness and profligacy of his writings, even in that immoral age, made it impossible to admit him to the company of English prelates; so he was sent over to Ireland, and made Dean of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and Vicar of Laracor in the Diocese of Meath. Bishop Mant remarks upon this :—"Preferment in Ireland may have been judged a further mitigation of the offence against propriety by removing him to a sequestered position." So little was then thought by English statesmen of the Church of Ireland, that the Dean of St. Patrick's was considered to be not a person of dignity and influence, but one occupying "a sequestered position."

and romances. They grow soon to find it a modish thing that looks like wit and spirit, to laugh at religion and virtue, and to become crude and unpolished infidels. This," he adds, "is a dismal representation of things."

We can hardly find, when we look at the ecclesiastical history of England in the early part of the eighteenth century, any divine, except Bishop Beveridge, who has been called "the restorer and reviver of primitive piety," who held and taught these two capital articles of the Gospel; Justification by faith in the atonement made by Christ, and Sanctification by the Holy Spirit. Arianism and Socinianism were preached by many leading clergymen of this time, the former heresy notably by Dr. Samuel Clarke, Rector of St. James's, Westminster. With such pastors to guard them, we cannot much wonder that the sheep went astray.

When these facts are known, we can hardly wonder at Archbishop King saying as he does :—"I think I could demonstrate that the Church has lost more hearts and ground these last four years in Ireland, than she did since King James came to the Crown ; and I have put it to some scores of the admirers of that ministry"—the ministry of Queen Anne—"to give one instance of one single step taken in all that time for the good of this kingdom in general, or the Church in particular, and I never could get an answer. I think I could show many to the detriment of both."

That the Church of Ireland was at this time able to exercise any spiritual influence, is due entirely to the fact that there were within her communion many excellent persons who used their influence for the spread of true religion among their fellow-countrymen. Foremost among these was the Rev. Nicholas Brown, Rector of the parishes of Donacavey, Dromore, and Rossory, who devoted himself to missionary work in several Irish-speaking districts, and persevered in his undertaking for several years with great zeal and energy. He possessed a thorough acquaintance with the Irish language, and was able to express himself in a manner which was both intelligible and agreeable to his hearers. By his great kindness, too, and by many works of charity among the poor, he gained their goodwill and affection ; and thus he took advantage of the great delight which he observed in them at

hearing the prayers of the Church offered up in their own tongue. He sought the people out in their own dwellings; he held public meetings; he attended at the places where they usually assembled to hear Mass, taking care to be present just as Mass was ended, and before the congregation had dispersed. Then he seized every opportunity of instructing them by reading to them chapters out of the Old and New Testaments, and reading the prayers of the Church out of an Irish Book of Common Prayer. In all this he was encouraged by his Diocesan, Dr. St. George Ashe, at that time Bishop of Clogher, and by Mr. Audley Mervyn, one of the Knights of the Shire for Tyrone.

At the same time a similar work was carried on in the South by the Rev. Walter Atkins, Treasurer of Cloyne Cathedral, and Vicar of Middleton. When he was appointed to his benefice, he had some knowledge of Irish, and he set to work at once to increase his acquaintance with the language. Having qualified himself to minister in Irish, he began to hold regular services, and, as opportunity offered, he visited the sick, baptized children, married the living, and buried the dead, always using the Irish Prayer Book. He, too, was greatly helped by Dr. Charles Crowe, Bishop of Cloyne.

Such was the effect produced by the labours of these two exemplary clergymen, that the Upper House of Convocation sent the following communication to the Lower House:—"That this House,

considering with great compassion the condition of the recusants of this Kingdom, and conceiving great hopes from the present juncture of affairs, that many of them may be prevailed upon to join themselves in communion with the Established Church, do think themselves obliged to thank God for putting such favourable opportunities into their hands, and to use more than ordinary endeavours at this time to improve it."

It was thereupon resolved :— " That the Holy Bible and Liturgy of the Church be printed in the Irish language, in the English character ; that some person be appointed to prepare a short exposition of the Church Catechism, particularly fitted for the instruction of the Popish recusants, and that the same be printed in Irish and English ; that fit persons be provided and encouraged to preach, catechize, and perform Divine Service in the Irish tongue, by the direction of the Ordinary, and with the consent of the Incumbent ; that such clergymen in each Diocese as are qualified by their skill in the Irish language for this work, and are willing to undertake it, have the preference, not only in their own parishes, but in any other parts of the Diocese ; that priests converted from the Popish religion, and judged qualified by the Ordinary, may be employed in the work, and encouraged by an addition to the allowance already settled on them by Act of Parliament ; that, to supply the cures of clergymen employed in this work, or to perform it where there are no beneficed clergymen

or converted priests qualified for it, one or more ministers be provided in each Diocese, who shall be engaged in the service of no particular cure; that the ministers of each parish be required to return the number of Popish families within their respective parishes to the Bishop in three years; that, to defray the charges of pursuing the foregoing measures, the Parliament be applied to for necessary provision; and that application be made to Her Majesty for granting Letters Patent to erect a Corporation, capable of receiving and disposing of charitable contributions for promoting the conversion of Papists in this Kingdom."

The aid of the University of Dublin was enlisted in the same good cause. Dr. Hall, the Vice-Provost, agreed to support at his own charge a person qualified to teach Irish privately to such of the students as desired to learn that language; and under the patronage of the Archbishop of Dublin, and with the consent and approbation of the Provost and Fellows, a Professor of Irish was appointed to teach the language publicly.

The Irish language has been taught in Trinity College, Dublin, ever since; and, for the encouragement of the study of the language, the Board some years ago placed the sum of £20 at the disposal of the Professor of Irish, to be given to such students as shall "distinguish themselves in the Irish language." The Irish Society, moreover, which has for one of its objects the circulation of the Holy Scriptures in the

Irish language, has, with the sanction of the Provost and Senior Fellows of Trinity College, founded four scholarships in the University, which are denominated "the Bedel Scholarships," and placed under the superintendence of Trustees named by the founders. The Scholarships are designed for such students only as give reasonable hope that they will be competent on their ordination to preach in the Irish language.

So far, then, as Trinity College is concerned, every encouragement has been given to the study of Irish; but the missionary work of the Irish Church, which it was proposed to carry on during the reign of Queen Anne in the manner set forth in the foregoing resolution, remained undone, until in comparatively recent times it was undertaken by the Irish Society, which founded the Bedel Scholarships. Of this important work I shall have something to say further on.

Queen Anne ruled over the destinies of the kingdom for thirteen years. She was a zealous Protestant, and really anxious for the spread of true religion; but she had little or no personal influence. Her ministers and favourites had very much of their own way; and the last thing they ever thought of was the circulation of the Bible in Ireland, or the religious instruction of the Irish-speaking portion of the population.

In the autumn of 1714, George I., Elector of Hanover, was proclaimed King of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

The history of the Church of Ireland during this reign may be learned, Bishop Mant tells us, from the character and conduct of several of the Irish Bishops who lived at this time. This, it may be observed, is hardly a fair criterion of the condition of the whole Church; but it may be possible to ascertain, from an examination of the actions of the rulers of the Church, something of the general drift of affairs. Dean Macartney says:—"We have seen that hitherto the conduct of successive rulers led us to believe that the Church was regarded as an instrument of government rather than a means of conveying Divine Truth; but it remained for this reign"—the reign of George I.—"openly to make that avowal, and for a Prelate to be the unblushing proclaimer of that disgraceful fact." He then quotes Archbishop King, who, writing in 1714, says:—"We have many candidates for these; and 'tis become a custom with us, that whoever pretends to any preferment, he immediately posts away to London. We have crowds there, and I find more are going, and some have waited two years, hunting for promotion. . . . . Your Grace is well apprized what a discouragement it is to men that reside and attend their cures, and, by that, support religion, to see others preferred before them, merely for attending at Court and neglecting their churches; the mischiefs that attend this practice are so many and great, that I will not pretend to enumerate them in a letter."

All the ecclesiastical records of this reign go to

prove the truth of Archbishop King's statement. Even Dean Swift says in a letter to Bishop Atterbury:—"We have recommended to a Bishopric one whom you would not allow to be a Curate in the smallest of your parishes." And the qualifications of a clergyman who was appointed Bishop of Elphin—his name is not mentioned—are thus described in a letter to Archbishop Wake:—"He was a great master of painting in little water colours, and by that greatly recommended himself to men in power and ladies, and so *was early made a bishop.*"

As a rule, Englishmen were at this time promoted to Bishoprics and Deaneries in Ireland, whilst meritorious Irishmen were passed over; but this would have mattered but little, comparatively speaking, if these English dignitaries had set to work diligently to preach the Gospel, and to discharge the other duties connected with their sacred calling. They did not do so. They lived, for the most part, in idleness. They neglected the work of the ministry. They were mere worldlings, who fattened on the "loaves and fishes" of their office. The Irish people saw in the heads of the Church a body of strangers placed in positions of influence and authority; and at the same time they saw the offices of religion either altogether neglected by the beneficed clergy, or discharged by a half-starved Curate.* In a parish of

* It is recorded of Dr. Savage, who about this time travelled to Rome with the Earl of Salisbury, that the king asked him one day at a levee how long he had resided in

considerable importance in the Diocese of Meath, I have myself seen the following entry in the register, an entry made in the beginning of the reign of George I.: Date: then the words:—"No service to-day, as I was absent in Dublin." After this follows "Ditto, ditto," for twenty-six consecutive Sundays, exactly six months; and then with grim irony this model parish clergyman has written these words at the foot of his record of absenteeism:—"Lord, I have loved the habitation of thine house, and the place where thine honour dwelleth." (Psalm xxvi. 8.)

There does not appear to have been much improvement, if any, during the reign of George II., which lasted from 1727 to 1760, thirty-three years. Primate Boulter certainly did something to promote the well-being of the Church. He employed the revenues derived from his See freely, bountifully, and beneficially for Church purposes; and especially encouraged the establishment of schools for the children of members of the Church. In these schools the Bible was carefully taught, and so was the Church Catechism; but he does not seem to have done anything to kindle zeal or piety among the clergy, and he completely ignored missionary work among the Roman Catholics by whom he was surrounded.

Rome with his Lordship. Upon Dr. Savage's answering the king, and telling him how long he had been in Rome, "Why," said the king, "you staid there long enough; how is it that you did not convert the Pope?" "Because, Sir," replied the Doctor, "*I had nothing better to offer him.*"

What might have been done to win Roman Catholics over to the principles of the Reformation is clear from their conduct towards the Established Church when, during the reign of George II., Ireland was threatened with a French invasion. Dr. Smollett tells us that, "however the Court of Versailles might have flattered itself that their invading army would, in Ireland, be joined by a great number of the natives, in all probability it would have been disappointed in this hope, had their purposed descent ever been carried into execution, for no signs of disaffection to the reigning family appeared at this juncture. On the contrary, the wealthy individuals of the Romish persuasion offered to accommodate the Government with large sums of money, in case of necessity, *to support the present Establishment against all its enemies;* and the Roman Catholics of the City of Cork, in a body, presented an address to the Lord Lieutenant, expressing their loyalty in the warmest terms of assurance." It is true that some dissatisfaction was expressed in Dublin when this loyal declaration of the citizens of Cork was made known to them. It is also true that there was some resistance made to the authority of the Viceroy; but it was put down without difficulty, and the example of insubordination did not spread to any of the provincial towns.

On October 25th, 1760, George II. died very suddenly; and George III. "reigned in his stead."

It is a somewhat remarkable fact that the three longest reigns in British history are those of three

kings, each of whom was the third of his name. Henry III. reigned 56 years; Edward III. 51; and George III. 59. This circumstance is alluded to in the following lines by an anonymous author:—

> "Chaste, pious, steadfast, merciful, and just,
> His pride, his people; and his God, his trust:
> To the third George approving Heaven ordained
> A life unblemished, and a death unpained;
> In goodness, greatness, years, his reign exceeds
> Henry's mild life, and Edward's laurelled deeds."

During this long period many stirring events took place in Ireland. The country passed through political troubles of no ordinary kind; and in the midst of strife and rebellion the Church found it very hard to carry on the work assigned to her. The personal character of the king was above all praise. It far exceeded what might have been expected from the age in which he lived, and from the circumstances in which he was placed. He believed in Christianity with his whole heart, and his life was pure and blameless. Even his bitterest enemies, if he ever had any, must have been compelled to admit that he was a pattern of all the domestic virtues. He looked upon his dominions, too, much in the same way as he looked upon his household. He regarded himself as the father of an immense family, for whose comfort he was bound carefully to provide. And yet, such was the indifference of his advisers to the condition of the people of Ireland, that it does not appear

that anything more was done during the reign of George III. for the enlightenment of the masses of the people of this country than was done during the reign of Henry VIII. Nothing was less dreamed of than the progress of true religion. So long as the Government of England could hold Ireland against every enemy, as a valuable possession of the Crown, it mattered little what religion the people professed, and what amount of secular education was imparted to them. Good appointments were, no doubt, occasionally made to posts of importance ; but everything goes to prove that excellence of character was no recommendation, and worthlessness was no bar to promotion in the Irish Church at this period. The experiment of converting the Irish to Protestantism, and its consequent loyalty, had failed.

But it will be said, What ought England to have done ? She ought to have watched over not merely the stability, but the efficiency of what should, from the days of the Reformation, have been regarded as a missionary church. She ought to have sent over to Ireland, not the worst, but the best, of her sons; and in every case where it was possible to do so, she ought to have selected Irish-speaking bishops and clergymen to fill dioceses and parishes. She ought to have aided the Irish Church in every legitimate effort to educate and to evangelize the Irish people. If she had done this, Ireland would now have been the grateful friend and the trusted ally of England, instead of being a source of incessant anxiety, and of

ever-increasing perplexity. England did not do this. For three centuries, at least, she tried to degrade the Church of Ireland by making her a political tool; and, instead of helping her to circulate the Holy Scriptures, and to preach the Gospel, she did her very best to crush out every manifestation of spiritual life within her own bosom, and every effort to carry on missionary work among the Roman Catholics in the midst of whom she was placed.

And what has been the consequence of this policy? Listen, ye British statesmen, to the words of as honest a Roman Catholic as ever lived, one who was a true Irish patriot, a Member of the Imperial Parliament, and a man of culture. Listen to the words in which he describes the result of the labours of your predecessors in this unhappy land. I quote from the recently published pamphlet of the late Mr. P. J. Smyth, M.P.—*The Priest in Politics*—1885. "One of the most eminent Catholic divines in Europe, contemplating the spectacle which Ireland presented lately, is reported—and I believe correctly—to have said that the Catholic Church had failed as a moral teacher in Ireland." . . . . . "As the individuals composing a nation are, such the nation is. If, individually, they are truthful, honest, kindly, virtuous, and brave, the nation which they compose will manifest in all its actions the same noble qualities. If, individually, they are untruthful, tricky, fraudulent, cruel, cowardly, and deceitful, the same qualities will characterize the nation, and be

photographed in all its public acts. The future of the Irish nation is in the hands of the priests, for with them, above all, is the power to mould, for good or ill, the character of the people." . . . . "Let them impress on the minds and hearts of their people that the Decalogue underlies all ritual, and all Church organisations, all civilisations, all politics, all governments, and all laws. It corresponds in theology with natural facts in physical science. Ignore those facts, and the material structure falls—a house built upon the sand. Ignore the Moral Law, the Ten Commandments, and every religious system falls, the solidarity of the human race perishes, society dissolves, and humanity itself, losing its spiritual element, ceases to be human."*

These are words of truth and soberness. Let us lay them to heart. England for three centuries placed every impediment in the way of the Church of Ireland, and almost crushed her out of existence. England left the Erse or Celtic population of Ireland for the whole of that time under the dominion of Rome; and now the priests of Rome in Ireland are

* The pamphlet from which this quotation is taken was written by Mr. P. J. Smyth a short time before his last illness. On his death-bed he expressed a wish that it should be published "*before the meeting of the Bishops in Rome.*" The solemn and sacred duty then rested on his widow to carry out his dying wish; and at the risk of incurring the anger of the Roman priesthood, and being held up to reprobation by the Ultramontane press, she has nobly done her duty.

England's avowed and relentless enemies, whilst the people, encouraged by their priests, are sinking fast into the abyss of Communism. Almost every Irish priest is, by virtue of his calling, an Irish agitator, one grand aim of whose life is to make Ireland altogether independent of England; and for this state of affairs England has only herself to blame.

## CHAPTER VI.

### UNION WITH ENGLAND.

THE Union of Great Britain and Ireland was proposed in the Irish Parliament on January 22nd, 1799. It was rejected by the Commons of Ireland on January 24th; the votes being 105 *for*, and 106 *against* the Union—a majority of *one* against the proposal. At the same time three divisions took place in the English House of Commons, the numbers being 140, 141, and 149 *for* the Union, and 15, 25, and 28 *against*. On February 5th, 1800, Lord Castlereagh detailed the plan of the Union in the Irish House of Lords, founded on the resolutions of the English Parliament, upon which a majority of Irish votes was obtained. In the Irish House of Commons, however, some resistance to the measure was displayed. Mr. Henry Grattan, although suffering from severe illness, made one of his most eloquent and powerful speeches against the Union. The debate which followed lasted sixteen consecutive hours. In the end the votes were 158 *for*, and 115 *against*. This sealed the fate of the Irish Parliament. On July 2nd, 1800, the Act of Union passed, and on January 1st, 1801, it took effect. From that

day to this the proper style and designation of the Kingdom has been "The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

Let it be here carefully noted that the 5th of the Articles establishing the Union—I quote from Gifford's Edition of *Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws and Constitution of England*—is as follows:—"That the Churches of England and Ireland be united into one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called the *United Church of England and Ireland;* that the doctrine and worship shall be the same; and that the *continuance and preservation of the United Church as the Established Church of England and Ireland shall be deemed* AN ESSENTIAL AND FUNDAMENTAL PART OF THE UNION; and that, in like manner, the Church of Scotland shall remain the same as is now established by law, and by the Acts of Union of England and Scotland."

It was reserved for the Right Honourable William Ewart Gladstone, M.P., nearly three quarters of a century later, to break through this solemn compact between two independent countries.

President Garfield, a man, as all the world knows, of the highest integrity, once said, when referring to the payment of the United States National Debt in greenbacks instead of gold:—"It is a fearful thing for one man to stand up in the face of his brother-man and refuse to keep his pledge; but it is a forty-five million times worse thing for a nation to do it. *It breaks the mainspring of faith.*"

No words could describe more accurately than these last words do the action of Mr. Gladstone and his followers with reference to the Church of Ireland. They have broken "the mainspring of faith."

The Act of Union had been preceded by the terrible Rebellion of 1798. Seven years before the rebellion actually broke out, Theobald Wolfe Tone, a clever barrister, formed the "Society of United Irishmen" in Belfast. A popular agitator in the Dublin Corporation, James Napper Tandy, founded a branch of the Society in the metropolis. These "United Irishmen" were intensely Republican. They had evidently been carried away by the lawless spirit which the French Revolution had evoked all over Europe, and they were animated, though they hardly knew why, by undying hostility to England and her political institutions. Each year the chasm between the two countries became wider and wider. In September, 1795, the battle of "the Diamond" was fought in the County Armagh. Then came the landing of the French in the West of Ireland. At last, in *ninety-eight*—a year that can never be forgotten in the history of this unhappy country—the storm broke in all its fury. Fearful crimes were perpetrated on both sides. Protestants and Roman Catholics, Loyalists and Rebels, were involved in one common ruin, and the seeds of political and religious rancour were sown, which at this moment are bearing bitter fruit. Of course, in the end military discipline prevailed over the wretched tactics of peasant hordes, the

law asserted its supremacy, and the king's Government triumphed over the leaders of a wild rabble. But the intense hatred of England, which was kindled by the Republican party, and fanned into a flame by the rebellion, has not yet burned out. The Act of Union was carried against the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland, and there are vast numbers now living in Ireland who would wish to see that Union dissolved. They cry out loudly for Repeal. They would, if they could, pronounce, as the Divorce Court does in the case of a union of quite another kind, a decree of separation *a mensâ et thoro*. No really patriotic Irishman, however, ought to desire a separation between the two countries, now that the Union has taken place, and has lasted for the greater part of a century. England and Ireland have been mated "for better or worse;" and if they will but make allowance for each other's faults and foibles, they may jog on very happily together, as other couples do, with only an occasional breeze to ruffle the placidity of their domestic sky. Whilst granting to the fullest extent that force, and fraud, and bribery, and chicanery were brought into full play in order to bring about the Union, it must, after all, be acknowledged, even by the most violent political partisan, that separation would now be disastrous to Ireland. In Union lies the strength of each country. Ireland is geographically, and by nationality, as much a part of the "United Kingdom" as Scotland is. Scotchmen have their national

predilections, and look back with pardonable pride to the warlike deeds of their forefathers; and yet they lose nothing, but rather gain everything, by their intimate connection with their friends "across the Border." Why should not Irishmen maintain *their* nationality, and, at the same time, make common cause with their friends "across the Channel"?

I have, perhaps, wandered away a little from my subject, but not so far as a merely superficial reader might suppose. For the political union between England and Ireland is very closely connected with the union between the Churches of the two countries. The political union remains in force, and long may it remain so. The ecclesiastical union, so far as external arrangements are concerned, has been severed. But there is a union in doctrine, in discipline, in worship, in sentiment, in sympathy, and in charity, which no Act of Parliament can for a moment touch or interfere with. The Church of Ireland is still, to all intents and purposes, one with the grand old Church of England, which is now, notwithstanding the Romanising tendencies of an insignificant minority of her members, thoroughly Protestant.

From a very early period, the clergy, both in England and in Ireland, had been supported by means of tithes. The circumstances of Ireland at the beginning of the present century were such that the levying of tithes for the support of the Protestant clergy was deemed to be a grievance; and it is impossible to deny that, as matters then stood, it was a substantial grievance.

Lord Castlereagh, in his proposals for the Union of the two countries, held out a hope that a remedy would, before long, be applied by the Imperial Parliament; but the realisation of this hope was so long deferred, that discontent sprang up on all sides. Not only were tithes obnoxious to the people generally, but the manner in which they were collected was most offensive. The Irish Parliament had thrown the burden of this impost on land under tillage, and consequently, for the most part, on small farmers. Except in some few cases, where special agreements for an annual payment were made with the Incumbent or his agent, the value of the tithes levied on each holding was ascertained by persons called tithe proctors, who visited the farms, walked through the fields, and determined what the cultivator or owner should pay. The latter had the option of accepting the valuation or throwing aside the tenth of the produce in the harvest field for the parson or his servant to carry away. The proctors were often hospitably entertained, and even bribed, in the hope that they would be lenient in their valuation; but they sometimes accepted both hospitality and bribes, and, in the end, severely mulcted the unfortunate farmer. It is hardly necessary to say that few, if any, really respectable men cared to become proctors, for they were hated with the most bitter hatred, and the Church of Ireland gained nothing in popular estimation by being associated with their odious exactions.

In 1832 the agitation against tithes became formidable. A regular "Tithe War" was waged. The resistance was universal. George IV., whose visit to Ireland had been the means of kindling among all classes a spirit of loyalty to the Throne, was dead. His successor was the popular Duke of Clarence, his brother, William IV., the "Sailor King;" but even he, with all his popularity, could not enforce the levying of tithes. He and his Government were compelled to resort to severe measures. Soldiers were employed to discharge duties from which, as soldiers, they naturally shrank, and which, in their inmost hearts they abhorred. They obeyed only because military discipline required them to do so. They were to be seen driving cattle, sheep, and pigs from the farmsteads to the Parsonages all through the country; and it is on record that in the County of Kilkenny a company of Hussars was seen driving before them a flock, consisting of *twelve geese.* Meetings for "Repeal," and "No Tithes," were held every Sunday. Mr. W. J. O'Neil Daunt says: "The meeting frequently comprised the inhabitants of many parishes. The dark multitudes streamed from the hills to the common centre; many on horseback, but the greater number on foot. There was a proud thrill in every man's heart; all felt the exhilarating consciousness that a nation was mustering to demand its rights. The chairman was often a Protestant, whose hatred of tithes was not less intense than that felt by the Catholic concourse around him."

It was quite clear that such a state of affairs could not last long. If the "Establishment" was to be maintained, some concessions were due to public opinion. The Legislature came to the rescue. Tithes were converted into a rent-charge, payable by the landlords, and the clergy were required to sacrifice one-fourth of their annual income. To the clergy the change was most beneficial. Not only were they enabled to avoid coming into collision with their Roman Catholic and other dissenting neighbours; but their income, although only three-fourths of the amount that it had been, was henceforward made secure. To the landlords the change was not unwelcome, for they received twenty-five per cent. of what had been the parson's income in return for the trouble of writing a couple of cheques in the course of the year. By the farmers the Tithe Commutation Act was regarded as a great boon because they were under the delusion that they had ceased to pay any tithe to the "Protestant Minister;" little dreaming, poor souls, that the commuted value of the tithe was, as a rule, included in the amount which they paid as rent to "His Honour." On the whole, the landlords were the chief gainers by the transaction. The arrangement, however, possessed this great merit, that it put an end to the agitation which had disturbed the country for many years; and it prevented any future collision between the clergy of the Church and those who conscientiously objected to receive their ministrations. In order to relieve the distress from

which many of the clergy suffered during "the bad years," as they were called, Parliament granted what was spoken of as a loan, but what really was, and was intended to be, a gift of *one million* pounds sterling.

My narrative would be incomplete without some reference to the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829.

In connection with this movement the burly figure of Daniel O'Connell comes to the front. The movement was preceded by one for the Repeal of the Union. On September 18th, 1810, a large number of influential gentlemen, some of them Protestants, met together in Dublin to petition Parliament for the Repeal of the Union, which had taken place in 1801. From this movement O'Connell and his followers stood aloof. They regretted afterwards that they had done so. English Liberals advised the leaders of the Irish Roman Catholics to endeavour first to obtain emancipation from the political and religious disabilities under which they laboured; and afterwards to demand the Repeal of the Union with England as a right. Emancipation *was* obtained, but by that time Irish Protestants had ceased to desire the Repeal of the Union.

From 1810 to 1829 nothing was thought of, nothing was spoken of in Ireland, but "Emancipation." At last, mainly through the perseverance and the clever tactics of O'Connell, the Roman Catholics of Ireland were permitted to aspire to the honour of a seat in

the British Parliament, and were declared to be entitled to many other privileges from which they had hitherto been debarred. In a letter written to the Earl of Shaftesbury, when the Royal assent was given to the Emancipation Act, O'Connell said :—"For more than twenty years before the passing of the Emancipation Bill, the burden of the cause was thrown upon me. I had to arrange the meetings, to prepare the resolutions, to furnish replies to the correspondence, to rouse the torpid, to animate the lukewarm, to control the violent and inflammatory, and to avoid the shoals and breakers of the law."

No one who is animated by the spirit of a true Christian can doubt that the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act was an act of simple justice. So long as it was necessary to repress disloyalty, severe measures, no doubt, were required; but when large numbers of Roman Catholics in Ireland had become loyal to the sovereign, and obedient to the law, it was only right that they should be freely admitted to all the privileges of citizenship.

In 1830 Lord Grey was called upon by the king (William IV.) to form a Cabinet after the fall of the Wellington administration. He did so, and one of his first acts as Prime Minister was to announce that he would adopt a policy of "peace, retrenchment, and reform." Some modern writers on political subjects, and nearly all modern journalists, attribute the introduction of the policy which is expressed in the three mystic words quoted above as due to

Mr. Gladstone; but Earl Grey was the first English statesman who used them, and professed to carry out the views which they indicate. One of the institutions which Earl Grey tried to reform was the Church of Ireland. It is very much to be feared that his object was not to reform the Church, but to please those to whom she was an object of dislike; and accordingly the Acts 3 & 4 William IV., c. 37, and 4 & 5 William IV., c. 90, were passed for the purpose of reducing the number of Archbishops and Bishops. The Sees had been classed in Provinces; as Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. The two latter Archbishoprics were extinguished on the death of the prelates then holding the office; and Cashel and Tuam thenceforward became Bishoprics. The eighteen Bishoprics were reduced to twelve, the number which the Church possesses now, and a body called "The Board of Ecclesiastical Commissioners" was formed to administer the property of suppressed Sees and other Church revenues. This body continued to exercise its functions until it was superseded by the Church Temporalities Commissioners, appointed under the Irish Church Act, 1869.

From 1832 to 1869, a period of forty-two years, no changes of importance occurred in the Church of Ireland, so far as her connection with the State was concerned. The period, however, was one of great internal activity. It was then that most of the religious Societies connected with the Church began to come prominently into view. Several of them had

been founded quite early in the century, but it was not until the time above-mentioned that they attained to anything like strength and vigour. It was then that great preachers and scholars arose within her communion to rival the fame of those who had made her so celebrated throughout Christendom in the early days of her history. When the enemies of the Irish Church were bent on disestablishing and disendowing her, they used very harsh language about her, forgetting apparently that there never was a period in her history when she less deserved the cowardly epithets that were hurled at her. By the eminent statesman who is responsible for her Disestablishment she was called a "Upas Tree;" but says the Rev. Dr. Brooke in his *Recollections of the Irish Church*, "To us in this country who have ever—God, He knoweth—found her sweet shade not like that of a deadly upas, but rather that of a green-spreading oak-tree; to us who have lodged in her beloved branches from infancy to manhood, and sat with our children under her shadow with great delight, the reading of all this unmanly invective from an assembly of 'men of honour and of cavaliers,' could not but fill us with a sensation as much of astonishment as indignation."

Just thirty years ago (1855) the *Irish Church Journal* was started in Dublin by two distinguished scholars, the Rev. William Fitzgerald, D.D., ex-Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Vicar of St. Anne's, Dublin,

afterwards Lord Bishop of Cork, and subsequently of Killaloe; and the Rev. J. G. Abeltshauser, LL.D., Professor of French and German in Trinity College, and Prebendary of St. Audoen's, Dublin. The Journal, after being published for two years under the title given above, had its name changed to that of *United Church Journal*. This periodical contains much valuable information on ecclesiastical matters, and to it I am indebted for an account, written by an anonymous contributor, of the circumstances which brought about the formation of a Society still in existence, and of which the Irish Church may reasonably be proud—the "Association Incorporated for Discountenancing Vice, and Promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion."

That there was abundant need for such an Association is painfully evident from the information given by the writer of the articles, entitled, "Ireland as it was, and as it is." The writer says:—"It has so often been asserted with such unhesitating boldness that the former days of Ireland were the period of her glory, and that her progress, during the past sixty or seventy years, has been downward, the nation sinking gradually lower and lower in the scale of wretchedness, that he who should dare to question the fact runs the chance of being stigmatized as altogether ignorant of the history of these times; and if perchance he should not only question it, but undertake to establish that, on the contrary, the country has improved during that time, in some respects sensibly

improved, there will be many, probably, who will give him as little credit for wisdom as for accuracy of information." He then goes on to show that there had been a manifest improvement in the morals of the people, and in the regard paid to religion; and he justly attributes the improvement to the influence exercised by the "Association."

The first meeting of the Association, he tells us, was held on October 9th, 1792. There were present only three persons, the Rev. Dr. O'Connor, the Rev. Singleton Harpur, and Mr. William Watson.

It has been remarked that a political revolution was effected in America through the agency of Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and J. Arnold, a bookseller, a farmer, and a horse-dealer. In Ireland, a moral revolution was brought about by a Fellow of Trinity College, a Dublin curate, and a bookseller.

Dr. John O'Connor was the son of a gentleman of small fortune in the County of Meath. He obtained a Fellowship in Trinity College in 1762, accepted the College living of Arboe in 1773; and afterwards removed to Castleknock, near Dublin. Mr. Harpur was for twenty-seven years curate of St. Mary's, Dublin; Mr. Watson was a bookseller. It was at his house, in Capel Street, that the first meeting was held.

The Resolutions adopted at the meeting were three in number:—"1. Resolved, that the rapid progress which infidelity and immorality are making through-

out the kingdom calls loudly on every individual, both of the clergy and of the laity, who has at heart the welfare of his country, or the honour of God, to exert all his powers to stem the baneful torrent. But, as many may be disheartened by considering the importance of separate attempts to discountenance vice, and to promote the cause of religion and piety, it appears to be advisable to associate for that laudable purpose. 2. That we will meet once a week, or oftener, if convenient, to consult upon the most likely means, under Providence, to restore the belief and practice of religion and virtue. 3. That, to guard against the danger of enthusiasm, it be established as a fundamental principle, that nothing be attempted contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Established Church, or that shall lead, in the smallest degree, to a separation from the same."

The Journal from which I am now quoting proves clearly that the task which these three excellent members of the Church had set themselves to accomplish was by no means an easy one.

Some idea, we are told, may be formed of the state of manners in Ireland about fifty years previous to the time at which the Association was established, from the following extract, taken from Bishop Berkeley's *Discourse addressed to Magistrates and Men in Authority.* He says :—" There cannot be a higher or more flagrant symptom of the madness of our times than that execrable fraternity of blasphemers lately set up within this city of

Dublin. Blasphemy against God is a great crime against the State. But that a set of men should, in open contempt of the laws, make this very crime their profession, distinguish themselves by a peculiar name (Blasters), and form a distinct society, whereof the proper and avowed business shall be to shock all serious Christians by the most impious and horrid blasphemies uttered in the most public manner; this surely must alarm all thinking men. It is a new thing under the sun reserved for our worthy times and country."

Such a frightful social ulcer must have been regarded with the utmost abhorrence by a prelate who was himself so remarkable for piety and integrity that Pope, without using the language of exaggeration, ascribed to him "every virtue under heaven;" and of whom Bishop Atterbury wrote:—"So much understanding, so much innocence, and such humility, I did not think had been the portion of any but angels, till I saw this gentleman."

We are further told that one sign of the corruption of the times was the prevalence of perjury. Sir Jonah Barrington, in his Memoir, mentions some of the ingenious expedients resorted to by those who wished to evade telling the truth. A favourite plan, he says, was to put a finger through a button-hole, and then the witness thought he might say, no matter how far removed from the truth his evidence was, "I swear it is true" (through). As might have been expected, little or no attention was paid at this

time to the observance of the Lord's Day. *Faulkner's Journal*, January 18th, 1770, contains this notice:—"There will be no Levée at the Castle until *Sunday*, 4th February next, as His Excellency, the Lord Lieutenant, proposes spending a few days in the country."

The Very Rev. Richard Graves, D.D., Dean of Ardagh, said in one of his sermons:—"Six days in seven are not deemed sufficient, by the upper classes, to waste in vain ostentation and unsatisfactory pleasure, when the morning of the Sabbath, like every other morning, after perhaps a careless visit to the temple of religion, rather to see and to be seen, to admire and criticise some popular preacher, than to fulfil the duties of humiliation and prayer—when, I say, after this, the whole of the Sabbath, like every other day, is consumed in the parade of ceremonial visits, and the display of dress and equipage; and its evening again collects the same light and dissipated crowds as every other evening, to bow and gaze, and to disperse again, to consume their hours not, perhaps, round the card table—some remnant of religious decorum generally, though not universally, excludes *this* favourite gratification—but in employments equally unprofitable, in frivolous conversation, in unmeaning compliments, or in uncharitable censure."

Lord Cloncurry, in his *Personal Recollections*, confirms the statement of Dean Graves. He tells us that it was "the custom on Sundays for all the great

folk to rendezvous in the afternoon upon the North Circular Road," and to spend the evening "in promenading at the Rotunda." He adds:—"I have frequently seen there of a Sunday evening a third of the members of the two Houses of Parliament." The classes who ranked lower in the social scale could not be expected to care much about religion when the nobility and gentry set them such a bad example.

Of all the abominations of those days lotteries were among the worst; and so far was the rage for lotteries carried, that one was started in 1770, in order to obtain funds for the purpose of erecting steeples on St. Mary's Church and St. Thomas' Church, in Dublin.

Drunkenness, too, and the fleshly lusts which usually accompany it, were so common all over Ireland, that they had almost ceased to attract observation. Profane swearing was habitually indulged in by every one who aspired to the character of a gentleman accustomed to good society. Even ladies were sometimes heard to interlard their conversation with fashionable oaths.

All this time Bibles and Prayer Books could only be had at a price which placed them beyond the reach of all but the wealthy classes.

It was clear that it was time to do something to stem the torrent of vice, and to promote virtue and religion. The "Association" founded by Dr. O'Connor, Mr. Harpur, and Mr. Watson, in seven years and a-half, from 1792 to 1799, distributed 22,225

Bibles and 36,668 Testaments, besides large numbers of Prayer Books. After this, examinations in Scripture and the Church Catechism were established in Dublin and in many parts of the country; Sunday Schools were founded, pure literature was circulated, and altogether a vast amount of good done.

Newland, in his *Apology for the Church of Ireland*, shows how the Association became in time a living witness to the wisdom and energy of our bishops and clergy, for its history, he says, is a proof "that all the Societies of late years founded for the circulation of the Bible, for the establishment of Sunday Schools, for the dissemination of the Scriptures in the Irish language, for the institution of Spinning Schools, and for the improvement of Prison Discipline, were unknown in this country till the bishops and clergy of the Established Church led the way, and set the bright example in the formation of all these numerous institutions, and showed by their example what could be effected even *in this benighted land.*"

This, however, was only the first step in a great religious movement which began to be felt early in the present century, and which now gives such vitality and energy to the Church of Ireland as she never possessed before.

In 1831 the "National Board," the State-school system of Ireland, was established by the late Lord Derby, who then, as Lord Stanley, filled the office of Chief Secretary.

This National Board system gave rise to a controversy which at one time threatened to shake the Church of Ireland to her very foundations. The system was objected to by most of the leading clergy, and by many of the influential laity of the Church. Some clergymen conscientiously supported and approved of it; and as not a few of these clergymen were promoted to Deaneries and even to Bishoprics by the Crown, a "National Board man" came to be regarded in every case as one who was looking to the Government for preferment. Few controversies of modern times have created such bitter feeling, and have given rise to so much acrimonious language on both sides.

Now that we can soar into a calmer region, and look down upon what was formerly the scene of conflict, we must admit that the opponents of the National Board fought in a good cause. They fought on the side of Religion against mere Secularism.

The National Board system was devised to establish a common ground on which Protestants and Roman Catholics could meet. That common ground could only be a ground from which all religion was carefully banished; and the result was that zealous Protestants and zealous Roman Catholics were equally dissatisfied, and have remained so to this day. It was argued with great truth on the Protestant side that the system ignores *History*, and is therefore to be repudiated as unpatriotic. The principle which banishes the Bible from the public instruction

of the National School banishes also our country's history. The legislation which excludes the God of Redemption excludes also the God of Providence. If the history of England and that of Ireland, fairly and impartially written, had formed from the beginning an essential part of the course of study in National Board schools, our peasantry would now have been too well instructed to be carried away by the appeals of demagogues, who may safely calculate on their ignorance of the past.

Then again, the National Board system ignores *Conscience*. It is based on a most defective view of human nature. It elevates the methods of intellectual culture above the processes on which the development of an upright character depends. It endeavours to strengthen the intellect rather than to influence the moral faculties, and so it subordinates the greater to the less. The only authority which can arouse the conscience and bend the will is the Divine authority as expressed in the Bible. But from all National Board schools in Ireland no reference whatever is permitted to the Bible during the hours allotted to secular instruction. Morals may be taught, it is true, on human authority alone; and "by this method," to use the words of Lord John Russell, "the difficulty is apparently got over, but in reality only to fall into a yet more serious one, that of attempting to teach morality without admitting that all morals derive their sanction from the Immortal Book, that our duties and obligations are derived

from a higher than a natural source." The National Schools of Ireland, bereft of the Bible and of all authentic History, are powerless for good. Their tendency is decidedly in the direction of Deism. They want that moral lever by which alone nations can be elevated and permanently upheld. That is the reason why Ireland has produced such institutions as the "Land League," and its successor the "National League."

The National system superseded the schools of the "Kildare Place Society," in which the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures was considered by the advocates of the National Board to be a vital defect. The original design was to give a united secular and separate religious education; but Archbishop Whately, who was then Archbishop of Dublin, soon felt and ably argued that the system could not work without a religious element; and accordingly the design was so modified as to include a united secular and non-sectarian religious and moral education, together with a separate denominational religious education for the children in attendance. Seven Commissioners were appointed to carry out this plan; three were members of the Church of Ireland, two were Roman Catholics, one was a Presbyterian, and one a Unitarian. The *Book of Scripture Extracts* was compiled. Sheet by sheet it was carefully examined, and at last unanimously approved by the Members of the Board. It was then transmitted by Archbishop Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin,

to Rome, and it actually received the sanction of the Pope. I make these statements on the authority of the late Rev. J. Y. Rutledge, D.D., Ex-Fellow of Trinity College, Rector of Armagh, as I find them given in a speech delivered by him at the Annual Meeting of the Church Education Society, held in Dublin, on April 10th, 1867. Besides the Scripture Extracts, a little *Book of Sacred Poetry* was compiled, and a work was written on the *Truths of Christianity*. These books were intended to form in every school the basis of the non-sectarian religious and moral education of the children. The result was, at first, supposed to be most gratifying. In their Report for 1841 the Commissioners said:—"We have not only thousands of schools under us, and hundreds of thousands of children attending them; but we have succeeded in compiling several works which contain a series of lessons grounded on Holy Writ, and which are used in the general instruction afforded in all our schools." Very severe censure was passed on the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church of Ireland, because they refused to lend their sanction to this scheme. They insisted on having the Bible, the *whole Bible*, and nothing but the Bible. They were told that "half a loaf was better than no bread;" but they could not see their way to be content with the half loaf, when they believed that they had a claim upon the whole.

They were right. In 1853 the Ultramontanes made their first successful attack on the principle of united

non-sectarian religious and moral education. Archbishop (afterwards Cardinal) Cullen then announced that it was "contrary to the spirit and practice of our Holy Church to sanction united religious instruction, or to sanction *any* instruction on matters connected with religion given to Catholics by persons who themselves reject the teaching of the Catholic Church." The key-note was struck, and Ultramontanes in all quarters caught up the sound. At last, a majority of the Commissioners, notwithstanding the strenuous efforts in a contrary direction of Archbishop Whately, Lord Chancellor Blackburne, and Baron Greene, succeeded in banishing the *Book of Scripture Extracts*, the *Book of Sacred Poetry*, and the *Truths of Christianity* from the hours of united education. Archbishop Whately charged the victorious majority with having broken faith with the Government, with the Patrons of schools, with the parents of the children, and with the children themselves. It was all of no use; and after two-and-twenty years of devotion to the system, and the utmost diligence in carrying it out, he was compelled to sever his connection with the Board. He wrote these words in explanation to the Lord Lieutenant: "I am convinced that nothing could be gained, very much the reverse, by my continuing a Commissioner under such an abandonment of the system hitherto pursued." Baron Greene also resigned, and so did Lord Chancellor Blackburne. The latter explained the reasons for his resignation in words

similar to those of Archbishop Whately. He said: "I joined the Board under the conviction that it would afford a large and valuable amount of religious combined with secular instruction. That was my reason for joining the Board. . . . I have very little confidence that this system will remain intact after they have taken away so important a part of it."

Archbishop Cullen and the Ultramontanes had gained a signal triumph. Very soon the influence of the Roman Catholic Bishops and Clergy became so great that the Board seemed to act entirely according to their instructions. Against this change a large majority of the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of Ireland protested, and in order to ensure that Protestant children should at any rate be taught the Bible, the Church Education Society was founded. In 1854 a petition, signed by 5,414 persons, was presented to the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in that document it was emphatically declared that "the Irish Clergy, in their steadfastness in refusing to connect themselves with the National Board, under conditions which would prevent them from instructing in the Holy Scriptures every child in attendance, have only acted in accordance with the principles of the Church, and in strict fulfilment of their ordination vows."

I do not hesitate to say that the influence of the National Board on the moral character of the people of Ireland, because of its attitude towards religion, cannot but be injurious in the extreme. The Bible

alone can purify the heart, can quicken the conscience, and can render the life conformable to God's will. No mere human books, unless indeed they derive their inspiration from the Bible, can do this. The National Board of Education in Ireland ignores the Bible. It withers where it should give beauty, it paralyses where it should give moral strength, and it, therefore, is gradually ripening the people for the wild anarchy of revolution. To no conclusion does the philosophy of history more certainly point than this, that the greatest calamities which have befallen nations have been the result, not of the want of intellectual culture, but of the want of moral principle. This opinion, it is most satisfactory to know, has been expressed in forcible language by one of the greatest Protestant divines of this century, the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, of the Church of Scotland. He said, a good many years ago, in one of his public speeches: "Knowledge, it is said, is power; and if knowledge be associated with religion, it becomes a power for the virtuous and the good, and tells with the best and most beneficent influence on the well-being of society. But, if knowledge be dissociated from religion, this destroys not the truth of the maxim that knowledge is power, but that is a power *emancipated from the restraints of principle;* and such a power let loose on society, like the deep policy of an artful tyrant, or the military science of a reckless conqueror, would have only the effect to enslave and destroy. Yes, gentlemen, we mean to have our schools, but

we mean in the economy of these schools to abide by the good old ways of our forefathers. We mean to have the Bible the regular and daily school-book. We mean to have the Catechism for a regular and daily school exercise. And these shall be taught openly and fearlessly; not dealt with as contraband articles, and smuggled into a mere hole and corner of our establishment; not mended or mutilated by human hands, that the message of the Eternal may be shaped to the taste and prejudices of men; not confined to the odd days of the week, or made to skulk from observation into a bye-room, lest the priests of an intolerant faith should be offended. No, gentlemen, we will place the Word of God in the forefront of our system of education, and we will render it the unequivocal, the public, the conspicuous object that is becoming a Christian and a Protestant nation." Noble words these, and worthy of our most careful attention at the present time.

I have now brought down the history of the Church of Ireland to a period immediately antecedent to her Disestablishment and Disendowment. It will be seen, as we proceed, how her enemies clamoured for her destruction; how Romanists and Protestant Dissenters entered, like Pilate and Herod of old, into an unholy alliance, that they might, if possible, crush her out of existence; how, notwithstanding all their devices, she emerged from the conflict in which she was compelled to engage more glorious than ever; and how she now stands before the world "fair as

the moon, and clear as the sun," bearing aloft the Divine Light in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation. I have shown, I think, that the modern Church of Ireland is the lineal descendant, in succession and doctrine, of the Church founded by St. Patrick. I have shown, too, that it was not until near the close of the twelfth century that she first formally connected herself with the See of Rome, and became enslaved to a foreign ecclesiastic; and that she subsequently returned to the primitive faith to which she now adheres. She is now what she was fourteen centuries ago; pure and apostolic: pure in the doctrines which she teaches, apostolic in the episcopal government which she upholds; the guardian of the Holy Scriptures, and the teacher of those imperishable truths "once delivered to the saints;" Catholic in her constitution, and yet Protestant in her resistance to the innovations of Rome.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE COMING STRUGGLE.

IN 1868 an important document was published which placed before the world the exact position of the Irish Church, so far as her revenues and her parochial arrangements were concerned. It was the "Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners on the Revenues and Condition of the Established Church (Ireland). Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty." The Commissioners were Earl Stanhope, the Earl of Meath, Viscount de Vesci, Sir Joseph Napier, Bart., Colonel Shafto Adair, Right Honourable John Thomas Ball, LL.D., E. P. Shirley, Esq., George Clive, Esq., and Edward Howes, Esq. They were authorized to inquire and report as to the several Archbishoprics, Bishoprics, Dignities, and Benefices; and also as to the several Ecclesiastical Corporations aggregate, existing in Ireland, and as to the revenues, property, and emoluments belonging to the same respectively." They reported that "the Irish Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland" consisted of two Archbishops, ten Bishops, thirty Corporations of Deans and Chapters, twelve Minor Corporations, or

quasi-corporate bodies connected with Cathedrals, thirty-two Deans, thirty-three Archdeacons, one thousand five hundred and nine Beneficed Incumbents (including within this term Perpetual Curates), and more than five hundred Stipendiary Curates. The number of persons returned by the census of 1861, as belonging to the Communion of the Church, was 693,357.

They further reported that the annual net revenues of the Church amounted to about £581,000, of which about £364,000 arose from Tithe Rent Charge, about £204,000 from the rents received from lands, and the residue from Government Stock, or other sources. Of these revenues, a considerable portion (about £113,000 a-year) was administered for Church purposes by the Central Board of Ecclesiastical Commissioners. About £19,000 a-year belonged to the Capitular Bodies, and was applied by them for the maintenance of the Cathedral fabrics and services. The residue supplied the endowments of the bishops, dignitaries, and beneficed clergy.

The Commissioners added this observation:—"The property of the Church has been derived from various sources before and since the Reformation. We have not considered it to be within our province to enter upon a historical inquiry into these sources; nor if it had been, would the limit of time permit us to complete such an inquiry. But with respect to the property acquired after the Reformation from Royal or Parliamentary grants, and property that

since the same period has been the gift of private individuals, we have inserted in the Appendix to this Report such particulars as appear in the Patent Rolls in Chancery, or in the Diocesan Registries." These gifts of private individuals were specially dealt with by the Church Temporalities Commissioners, appointed under the Irish Church Act of 1869.

There were in Ireland in 1868, according to the Report of the Royal Commissioners, 1075 Benefices, the net income of which was under £300 a-year. About 355 of these were above £200, about 420 of the remainder above £100 a-year, and about 300 under £100 a-year. Among these were many with a large Church population; some in important towns, and others so circumstanced that a supplementary provision for suitable Church ministration was much needed. The recommendations of the Commissioners amounted, in the aggregate, to twenty. Among other changes, they recommended—but not unanimously—that in future there should be only *one* Archbishop in Ireland, the Archbishop of Armagh; that the Archbishopric of Dublin should be reduced to a bishopric, the bishop having precedence over all other bishops of the Church of Ireland; that the income attached to the Primatial See of Armagh should be £6,000 a-year; that if Dublin be retained as an archbishopric, an income of £5,000 a-year be provided, and if reduced to a bishopric, £4,500; that every other bishopric have an income allotted to it of £3,000 a-year, with an additional allowance of £500 for such

of the bishops as in each year attend Parliament. These incomes and allowances, it was recommended, should be free from any tax or deduction for ecclesiastical purposes.

It was proposed, too, that the number of Sees should be reduced to *eight;* and that, as there did not seem any sufficient reason for maintaining a larger number of Cathedral establishments than of Sees, it was suggested that, with the exception of eight, all the existing Corporations of Deans and Chapters be dissolved.

Then again, it was thought, and very properly too, that the number of archdeacons—thirty-three—was a good deal in excess of what was required. It was, moreover, considered advisable that, with a view to carry out these and other recommendations, and for the purposes of a more effective management of Church property, the constitution of the Board of Ecclesiastical Commissioners be improved, and its powers enlarged; and that more stringent and summary powers of enforcing residence be given to the bishops and Ecclesiastical Courts.

If the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners had been carried into effect, the Church would, undoubtedly, have been rendered more efficient as a religious institution; and no one would have suffered any injustice. But a political storm was brewing at the very time the Report from which I have quoted above was published; and that storm burst over in Ireland in the course of the following year.

The year 1868 was rendered memorable in the history of the Church of Ireland by the meeting of the Church Congress in Dublin.

The Congress was graced by the presence, and moved to enthusiasm by the eloquent speeches, of several distinguished English bishops, clergymen, and laymen; whilst, at the same time, the Church of Ireland was worthily represented by some of her most eminent scholars and orators, both lay and clerical.

On Tuesday, September 29th, the Very Rev. W. C. Magee, D.D., then Dean of Cork, now, and for many years past, Bishop of Peterborough, preached "the Congress Sermon" in St. Patrick's Cathedral, to a very large congregation. It was a celebrated sermon, founded on the text (Luke v. 7):—"And they beckoned unto their partners, which were in the other ship, that they should come and help them."

On Thursday, October 1st, the late Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., the talented and eloquent Bishop of Oxford, preached in the same Cathedral a sermon in aid of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Church Missionary Society. He took as his text St. John xvii. 26 (part):—"I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it."

Among the speakers who took part in the proceedings of the Congress were the President, His Grace the Right Hon. Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., who was then, and until very recently, Archbishop of Dublin;

Hon. and Rev. William C. Plunket, now Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin; Right Rev. Robert Daly, D.D., Bishop of Cashel; Ven. George A. Denison, Archdeacon of Taunton; Very Rev. Maurice Day, D.D., Dean of Limerick, now Bishop of Cashel; Very Rev. Hugh M'Neile, D.D., Dean of Ripon; Right Hon. Robert R. Warren, Attorney-General for Ireland, now Judge of the Court of Probate; Rev. George Salmon, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin; Rev. C. P. Reichel, D.D., now Bishop of Meath; Rev. J. C. Ryle, now Bishop of Liverpool; the Right Rev. William Alexander, D.D., Bishop of Derry; with many others too numerous to mention, but equally celebrated as sound theologians and diligent workers in the cause of religion.

Among the subjects discussed at the Congress was that of "Church Work and Life." The opening paper was read by the Very Rev. John C. Macdonnell, D.D., Dean of Cashel, now Rector of Misterton, in the Diocese of Peterborough. The Dean said, and said very truly, that "there is no fallacy greater than that which represents the Church in Ireland as the Church of the rich. It is true that the great majority of the landowners are members of it; but, unfortunately, the wealthiest proprietors are generally non-resident. The clergyman often does not know the faces of one-half of those who own the soil of his parish. In most cases, those who are rich are not resident, and those who are resident are not rich; and in works of charity the contributions come (with a few bright

exceptions) from the struggling residents, not from the wealthy absentees. Such is the work of the country pastor; and though at the end of the year he may be able to point out few tangible results of his labours, though, perhaps, he has lost some of his best and most hopeful disciples by emigration, he knows that he has not been idle, that he has been doing work which ought to be done, and which he would not have been justified in neglecting to do; and that if he can point to no signal instance of work done, he has been raising the standard of piety and civilization, and mixing a savour of heavenly things with the more worldly life with which he has been encompassed." The Dean said further:—"There is a life, a real and, I believe, a growing, religious life and Church feeling among us. And these small congregations are not only trustees for the Church of the future, keepers and witnesses of that truth which, we hope, will one day shine upon all; but they exercise, even now, an amount of indirect influence upon the Nonconforming population around them which is generally undervalued, but which is still the main instrument of progress and enlightenment in Ireland. Our lights may be faint lights sometimes—shining in a dark place—but *you will not hasten the coming of day by their extinction.*"

Never were truer words spoken, and never were words more required, than these were at the very time that they were spoken in the hearing of the Congress assembled in Dublin.

The subject opened by Dean Macdonnell was continued by the late Rev. Alexander Irwin, M.A., Rector of Armagh—a man whose memory will be revered as long as the Irish Church lasts. Mr. Irwin, reviewing the history of the Church during the first sixty years of the present century, observed, very justly, that "when religion is making progress in a country, there will be vigorous efforts made to provide suitable and becoming places of worship, sufficient in number and in size for the congregations; and also to provide an adequate supply of ministers to attend to the spiritual wants of the people. "How then," he asks, "do matters stand in these two respects? Within the last sixty years," he replies, "more than 500 additional churches have been erected. And besides these new churches which have been built, 242 old ones have been enlarged. And superadded to these churches, 172 schoolhouses and other buildings are licensed by the bishops to be used for Divine Service. That is to say, there are 672 more places in which the public worship of God is statedly conducted than there were in the year 1806. It is to be borne in mind, moreover, that during the last thirty years emigration has been thinning the numbers, not merely of Roman Catholics, but of the members of the Established Church; yet the attendance on Divine Worship has, in many parishes, so much increased, that new churches have had to be built, and old ones enlarged. . . . . Within the last thirty-five years more than £370,000 have been contributed

by Irish Churchmen for building, enlarging, improving, and endowing churches. And this, without including the munificent sum of £150,000, which Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness laid out on the restoration of St. Patrick's Cathedral. If that sum were included, *more than half a million of money has been expended by the members of the Church in Ireland on their places of worship within the last five-and-thirty years.*"

Then, as regards the supply of clergy, Mr. Irwin stated that since the year 1806 they had been increased by 919. The attendance of the people, not only at Morning and Evening Service, but at the Administration of the Holy Communion, had also largely increased; and great attention was being paid to Church music, and to the publication of hymns adapted to encourage congregational singing. On the support of schools which did not receive any grant from the State, members of the Irish Church, in thirty-seven years, expended no less than £1,049,000. Sunday Schools had been established all over the country; and in the Province of Armagh alone there were in 1868, according to Mr. Irwin, 60,260 scholars, and 5,532 unpaid teachers, all under the superintendence of the clergy of the Church. There were in 1868 thirty-five Protestant Orphan Societies in Ireland connected with the Church; and since these Societies were established, Irish Churchmen had, up to that date, contributed more than £400,000, and had provided for more than 10,000 orphans.

"Where there is spiritual life in a Church," Mr. Irwin also observed, "it will manifest itself in hearty efforts to extend the knowledge of the Gospel beyond its own borders, and to spread the religion of Christ among those who never heard His name. Church work in Ireland includes this department also." He then went on to inform his audience, who, long before he had concluded his paper, must have been filled with astonishment, that, during the sixty years immediately preceding, the Church of Ireland had raised nearly £188,000 for the Church Missionary Society and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; £126,593 for the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews; £126,644 for the Irish Society engaged in circulating the Scriptures in the Irish language; besides other sums, the amounts of which are not specified, in aid of other Societies. "And yet," he added, "it is when the Irish Church is thus busily engaged in Christian labour of every kind, when it is manifesting so much activity and zeal and usefulness, that it is assailed with reproaches as being a cumberer of the ground that has borne no fruit, and therefore ought to be cut down."

The discussion of this important subject at the Church Congress was continued by the Hon. and Rev. William C. (now Lord) Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin; Rev. Henry Jellett, D.D., now Archdeacon of Cloyne; Rev. Dr. Salmon, F.T.C.D.; the Lord Bishop of Derry; the Dean of Ripon; Colonel R. S.

Adair; and the Lord Bishop of Oxford. The last words spoken on this subject were uttered by the Bishop of Oxford. They were as follows:—"I shall venture to say that I cannot believe it possible that a Church containing men capable of speaking and acting as this morning has shown *you* can speak and act, possessed by the highest Christian principles, understanding and rising in the knowledge and the application of all the deep rules which the Church of Christ has received and embodied—I cannot believe it possible that such a body can really be approaching to any great destruction of her usefulness, or any lasting diminution of her fame."

It was all of no use. The cry of Disestablishment and Disendowment had been raised for party political purposes, *not* by Irish or English Roman Catholics—it is important to bear this in mind—but by the Radical Dissenters of England, who hoped that as soon as the Church of Ireland had been disposed of, it would be comparatively easy to attack and to overthrow the Church of England.*

*Delenda est Carthago.* This was the rallying cry of the political party which arrogates to itself the title "Liberal," and which was determined to try the experiment of governing Ireland "according to Irish ideas!"

* Preparations are at this moment (1885) being made for an organized attack on the Church of England by the Liberation Society; and a fierce contest may be expected next year.

Scipio Africanus appeared in the person of Mr. Gladstone.

During the early part of his career Mr. Gladstone had been the bold and uncompromising champion of the Church, both in England and in Ireland, as an "Establishment." Speaking in the House of Commons, in 1835, he said:—"There is no principle upon which the Church Establishment can be rightly or permanently upheld, but that it is the Establishment which teaches the truth. The Government, *as a Government*, is bound to maintain that form of belief which contains the largest portion of truth with the smallest admixture of error. Upon that ground the Government of this country maintains the Protestant and declines to maintain the Roman Catholic Religion."

And in Mr. Gladstone's *Essay on the State in its Relations with the Church*, the fourth edition of which was published in 1841, he said:—"When foreigners express their astonishment at finding that we support in Ireland the Church of a small minority, we may tell them that we support it on the high ground of conscientious necessity for its truth. . . . . It is a question of spiritual truth in Ireland, arrayed against a Church which we sorrowfully hold to have hidden the light that is in her amidst the darkness of her false traditions, and which adds to the evils of false doctrine those of schism. . . . . A common form of faith binds the Irish Protestants to ourselves; while they, on the other hand, are fast linked to Ireland,

and thus they supply the most natural bond of connection between the two countries. But if England, by overthrowing their Church, should weaken their position, they would no longer be able, perhaps no longer willing, to counteract the desires of the majority, tending, under the direction of their leaders, to what is called *national independence*."*

It will be recollected that this Essay was severely criticized soon after its publication by Lord Macaulay; so severely indeed that his criticisms were felt by many to be dictated by a feeling of personal dislike to the writer.

In the course of time Mr. Gladstone's views veered completely round.

On March 30th, 1868, he said in the House of Commons:—"One of the arguments generally advanced for the maintenance of the Irish Church is that to disestablish it would be contrary to the assurances of the Roman Catholic party. Now, I cannot consent that any such assurance should bind me to uphold what I conceive to be unfair to the Catholics, and injurious to the empire. In this matter I say we should exercise our own freedom, and judge what is for the common good; and it is *for the common good* I ask you to consent to the disendowment of the Established Church in Ireland. . . . We think the time has come for this great and beneficial change to be brought about in Ireland, and we com-

* See recent speeches of Mr. Parnell and other members of the so-called Irish Parliamentary party.

mend it most earnestly to the acceptance of this House, as a step that is alike needed for the honour of Parliament, for the satisfaction and contentment of Ireland, and for the purpose of removing a stain from the name and good fame of the State, the Law, and the People of this country."

At Wigan, on April 27th, 1868, Mr. Gladstone said of the Church of Ireland :—"It is there as a tall tree of noxious growth, lifting its head to heaven, and darkening and *blasting the land so far as its shadow can extend.*"

And again, in the House of Commons, on the introduction of the Irish Church Bill, March 1st, 1869 :—"Of the Established Church of Ireland, I will only say, that although I believe its spirit to have undergone an immense change since those evil times, yet *unfortunately it still remains, if not the home and the refuge, yet the token and symbol, of ascendancy;* and so long as the Establishment lives, painful and bitter memories of ascendancy can never die."

I am indebted for these extracts to the valuable papers published in 1869 by the Central Protestant Defence Association for Ireland.

It would, of course, be wrong to assert that on important social, political, or religious subjects, a man may not sometimes see fit to change his mind; but for any change of opinion on such subjects good and substantial reasons ought to be given. Mr. Gladstone appears to have been influenced, not by reason, but

by passion; not by sound argument, but by the desire to advance the interests of the political party with which, in the latter part of his public life, he has identified himself. And therefore the late Bishop of Ossory (Right Rev. Dr. O'Brien) was quite justified in saying of him as he did: "I know, indeed, no sadder spectacle than that of a man of high gifts under the influence of causes which disturb the judgment, and sometimes unconsciously warp the reason, disappointing, as life advances, all the promise of his earlier years, gradually withdrawing his great powers from the worthy objects to which they were dedicated in his youth, and concentrating them upon some lower aims, exerting them at the bidding of the hard taskmasters to whom he has bound himself; and so, it may be, with new associates, employing them to overthrow some great cause which they were formerly devoted to maintain:—

"'Like captive Samson, making sport for all
Who feared his strength, and triumph in his fall.'"

It must be carefully borne in mind, that although Mr. Gladstone speaks of the Church of Ireland as a "badge of ascendancy," it was not regarded in that light, at any rate in 1866, by the *Tablet*, the principal organ of Roman Catholic opinion in England. In an article published January 27th, 1866, the *Tablet* said:—"The wound of Ireland is, that whereas the great majority of the population are Roman Catholics,

such a large proportion of the soil belongs to Protestants, and that Protestants form so large a portion of those classes which, by superior wealth and superior advantages, are raised in social station above the rest. We are convinced," adds the *Tablet*, "and on evidence than which demonstration could scarcely be more conclusive, that if the Legislature were to confiscate to-morrow every acre of land, and every shilling of Tithe Rent Charge now belonging to the Protestants of Ireland, and were to deprive the Protestant Bishops and clergy of every legal advantage which they now possess by virtue of belonging to the State Church, they would not have *abated the Irish grievance or cured the Irish disease;* they would have only caused a change in the form of words by which the complaints of those who feel aggrieved find expression."

Mr. Gladstone knew perfectly well when, in 1869, he propounded his scheme for Disestablishment and Disendowment, that enlightened Roman Catholics did not regard the Church of Ireland with disfavour; but it was absolutely necessary, for party purposes, to satisfy the demands of Mr. Miall and the Liberation Society; and so the Irish Church Bill was framed. As a specimen of the unfairness manifested by *some* English Dissenters towards the Irish Church, I cannot help referring to a lecture delivered by the Rev. Thomas Michael, in the Mechanics' Hall, Halifax, on July 9th, 1868, in reply to an address on the Disestablishment of the Irish Church by the Rev. W.

Robert Morrison, M.A., Incumbent of St. James', Halifax. The lecturer quotes largely in support of his views from Lord Macaulay, who, as I have said elsewhere, was a Dissenter, and whose prejudices against the Church were very strong; but not content with this, he quotes also, as authorities on his side, the Rev. Sidney Smith, "the witty Canon of St. Paul's," whose jokes may be laughed at, but who certainly was no authority on Irish Church matters, and the Rev. Dr. Brady, a clergyman of the Irish Church, who, years ago, "went over" to Rome. Mr. Michael's own *animus* may easily be seen in the following words which I quote from his lecture. He says: "Mr. Morrison reiterates his opinion that the Irish Church possesses capacities for work in opposing Romanism, and shows that in the Diocese of Cork alone, some eight or nine Churches have been erected within the last few years! That these things should be done in the very stronghold of Roman Catholicism is to him a most substantial proof of the vitality of the Irish Church, and that she 'might yet, with God's grace, accomplish great things for Ireland.' *With God's grace* is the saving clause of the paragraph before us. With the favour of courts, with the land and money of Hibernia, the Irish Church has done little or nothing, but, with God's grace, she may accomplish great things for Ireland. Yes; with that grace leading her to see the injustice of quartering herself on a people who refuse her doctrines, and think meanly of her ritual;

with that grace moving her to cast herself upon the gifts and self-sacrifice of those who accept her teaching; with that grace bringing her to unreserved reliance upon Him who said, 'I hate robbery for a burnt offering,' the Irish Church may yet develop her capacities, and communicate her 'vitality,' to an extent of which her friends have never conceived."

The past history of the Church clearly proves that this language is altogether unjustifiable; but the statements of Mr. Michael will appear very tame when placed beside many which were published by the supporters of the "Liberation Society," during the three years immediately preceding the passing of the Act of Disestablishment.

On Monday, March 1st, 1869, Mr. Gladstone moved—"That the Acts relating to the Established Church (Ireland), and to the College of Maynooth, and the first Resolution of the House of Commons, in the Session of 1867-8, relating to the Established Church (Ireland), be read."

The Clerk then read the titles of the Acts and the Resolution referred to, after which the House went into Committee.

Mr. Gladstone then rose and said:—"The motion, Sir, which, in concluding, I shall propose to the Committee is, that the chairman be directed to move the House that leave be given to bring in a Bill to put an end to the Established Church in Ireland, and to make provision in respect to the temporalities thereof, and in respect of the Royal College of Maynooth."

For three hours and a half he held the House spell-bound with his eloquence. The peroration of this remarkable speech showed clearly that the speaker regarded the subject with which he had been dealing as one of supreme importance; but it is impossible to conceal from ourselves that he handled it in the spirit of a partisan rather than in that of a patriot. "We are undoubtedly asking," he said, "an educated, highly respected, and generally pious and zealous body of clergymen to undergo a great transition; we are asking a powerful and intelligent minority of the laity of Ireland, in connection with the Established Church, to abate a great part of the exceptional privileges they have enjoyed: but I do not feel that, in making this demand upon them, we are seeking to inflict an injury. I do not believe they are exclusively, or even mainly, responsible for the errors of English policy towards Ireland. I am quite certain that in many vital respects they have suffered by it. I believe that the free air they will breathe under a system of equality and justice, giving scope for the development of their great energies, with all the powers of property and intelligence they will bring to bear, will make that Ireland which they love a country for them not less enviable and not less beloved in the future than it has been in the past. As respects the Church, I admit it is a case almost without exception. I don't know in what country so great a change, so great a transition, has been proposed to the ministers of a religious communion

which has enjoyed, for many ages, the preferred position of an Established Church. I can well understand that to many in the Irish Establishment such a change appears to be nothing less than ruin and destruction. From the height on which they now stand, the future is to them an abyss; and their fears recall the words used in *King Lear*, when Edgar endeavours to persuade Gloster that he has fallen over the cliffs of Dover, and says:—

> 'Ten masts at each make not the altitude
> Which thou hast perpendicularly fell;
> Thy life 's a miracle.'

And yet, but a little while afterwards, the old man is relieved from his delusion, and finds that he has not fallen at all. So, I trust, that when, instead of the fictitious and adventitious aid on which we have too long taught the Irish Establishment to lean, it should come to place its trust in its own resources, in its own great mission, in all that it can draw from the energy of its ministers and its members, and the high hopes and promises of the Gospel that it teaches, it will find that it has entered on a new era of existence, an era bright with hope, and potent with good."

I have taken the foregoing quotation from a full and accurate report of Mr. Gladstone's speech, published in the *Daily Express* of Wednesday, March 3rd, 1869.

Commenting on the speech, the *Times* said that "no one could have listened to Mr. Gladstone's

speech without admiring the art of arrangement he displayed. The order of procedure was so marshalled that the scheme of the Ministry was made intelligible to every one." The *Daily Telegraph* said that "Mr. Gladstone never before displayed a more vigorous grasp of his subject, more luminous clearness in its development, earnestness more lofty, or eloquence more appropriate or more refined." Most of the daily papers praised the manner in which Mr. Gladstone handled his subject. The *Herald*, however, said that "the speech fell far short of the occasion. Mr. Gladstone aimed at the sublime, and once or twice came near it, but throughout generally dwelt in the region of commonplace, and was tedious." Several other papers endorsed this opinion.

Within the limits of the space which I have prescribed to myself it will be impossible for me to do more than to touch, briefly, upon a few salient points of the discussions which arose in both Houses of Parliament, as the Bill passed through successive "readings." One expression of opinion I cannot think of omitting; that of Mr. Disraeli (afterwards Earl of Beaconsfield). He made one of his most brilliant speeches in the House of Commons on the third reading of the Bill. After referring to the Fenian conspiracy, and to the political discontent visible in Ireland, he said:—"Ireland is discontented again; Ireland is disturbed again. There is one remedy for that discontent, and that disturbance. It is the abolition of the Protestant Church, and the

confiscation of its revenues. Have we evidence that if we abolish that Church, and confiscate its revenues, we shall render Ireland contented and tranquil? Sir, so far as I can form an opinion, that evidence does not exist. I receive myself a great many letters every day upon the state of Ireland. We have learned from a gentleman, during these recent debates, how much he was applied to in the same manner. I don't know whether his correspondence exceeds mine, but mine is of two kinds. I have a correspondence from gentlemen, and also from ladies (a laugh). Though you may smile, if I were to read some of those letters to the House, you would find that they are of a harrowing character. There are letters which I have received from Irishmen and Irishwomen, describing a state of affairs which would make every countenance serious if you heard them. The writers are extremely alarmed, and I am not in a position to relieve them, or to remove their alarm. I receive a great many letters from clergymen of the Established Church in Ireland. They are alarmed at Her Majesty's Government (a laugh). They are not alarmed at the state of the country. Some of those clergymen live in Tipperary, and others of them live in Westmeath; but not one of them tells me that he is in danger, that his life is menaced, or that he is under the least apprehension of offence or personal attack from his Irish fellow-countrymen. Though almost every week we have accounts of outrages in Ireland, I have not heard that any clergyman of the

Established Church has been a victim (hear). No Irish clergyman of my acquaintance has ever alluded to disturbance. Then, I say, what is the evidence that if we abolish the Irish Church, and confiscate its revenues, we shall cause any diminution of the discontent and disturbance which prevail among a portion of the Irish people, inasmuch as it does not appear that the discontent and disturbance arise from any of the accidents of the Irish Church? Surely if the abolition and confiscation of the Church and its property would be sufficient to remove that discontent and disturbance, we should have some accounts of assaults on the persons of the Irish clergy (a laugh). Will the Hon. gentleman who laughs be good enough to explain why it is that the landlord should be assassinated, while the clergyman is left unharmed? If the persons who commit these outrages are discontented with the landlord, or with the class to which he belongs, and prove their discontent in the manner that has lately been exhibited, why should they not assault the clergyman if they are discontented with him, or with the class to which *he* belongs? But, on the contrary, the clergyman is in a state of complete security; he makes no complaint of the circumstances under which he passes his existence; and so far as his letters are concerned, you would never suppose that his country was disturbed. I ask again then what evidence have we that this violent remedy will effect the cure for which it is brought in? But in itself, the objections to it are very considerable,

totally irrespective of those general ones to which I have alluded. If the Right Hon. gentleman proposed to confiscate the property of the Protestant Church, and apply it to the Roman Catholic Church, though I should consider it an unwise and unjust measure, it would be an intelligible proposition. It would be a proposition for which arguments could be urged, and which, at least, would be consistent with the principles which the Right Hon. gentleman professed in introducing this measure. But what does the Right Hon. gentleman say? I propose to confiscate the property of the Protestant Church because the Roman Catholic Church is discontented. What does that amount to? To a recognition of the principle of Socialism. A man comes forward and says:—'I am a poor man, and I am discontented because another man has an estate and a park. I don't want his estate and park, because I know that every man cannot expect to have an estate and a park; but take them away from that other man, and I shall be content.' Well, that is Socialism, and it is the policy which Her Majesty's Ministers now propose to adopt."

Mr. Disraeli concluded his really eloquent speech in these words:—"We are going, if we agree to this Bill to-night, so far as the House of Commons is concerned, to give a vote which will be the most responsible public act that any man, on either side of the House, ever gave (continued cheering). You may have a great majority now; you may cheer, you

may indulge in all the jubilation of party triumph; but this is a question as yet only begun (hear, hear), and the time will come, and come ere long, when those who have taken a part in the proceedings of this House this night, whatever may be their course, and whatever their decision, will look upon it as the gravest incident of their lives, and the most serious scene at which they have ever assisted. I hope that when that time shall come, none of us, on either side of the House, will feel that he has, by his vote, contributed to the disaster of his country" (cheers).

In the foregoing speech Mr. Disraeli, with an inaccuracy which one would not have expected from so eminent a statesman, and so great a master of language, uses the expression "abolition of the Irish Church;" but the Irish Church had arrived at the determination that she would not be "abolished." The legal bond which united her with the Church of England, and with the State, might be severed, and she might be deprived of all her property; but she could not be blotted out of existence by any Act of Parliament.

Whilst the House of Commons was plotting her destruction, she gave a marvellous proof of her vitality. A Conference, summoned by her two Archbishops, met in Dublin on the 13th and 14th April, 1869. Delegates, both lay and clerical, attended from every Diocese in Ireland, and resolutions were moved and seconded by some of the ablest men within her communion, and carried unanimously. The speeches

in which these resolutions were commended to the approval of the Conference are masterpieces of eloquence. I proceed to give my readers a few extracts from them; but the space at my disposal compels me to quote only the most remarkable of these utterances.

His Grace the Lord Primate (Right Rev. Marcus Gervais Beresford, D.D.), in opening the proceedings, stated that during the previous ten years strenuous exertions had been made by the Irish prelates to obtain the revival of the Irish Convocation. These efforts had not been successful. His Grace added:—"In an assembly composed of such very great numbers of persons from all parts of the country, coming together to discuss a subject in which the innermost feelings of their souls are most deeply aroused; assembled as they are to defend that which they hold dearer than life, not only for themselves, but for posterity, it cannot be but that their feelings will be aroused to the uttermost; and, therefore, I would impress upon the meeting, and upon every individual of it, the necessity of putting a restraint upon themselves, and of endeavouring to meet these unparalleled circumstances in which we are placed with calmness, with moderation, with dignity, with determination, and with firmness. We should be glad that every person in Ireland, and in England too, knew how dearly we value our privileges; but that, however deeply our feelings are hurt, we can speak with the firmness of men, and with the

moderation of Christians. There is one thing that this meeting must clearly understand—namely, that this Conference has no reference, in the remotest degree, to Mr. Gladstone's Church Body. We studiously avoided giving this idea the slightest countenance in any way whatever. This is an assembly met together for the specific purpose of considering this Bill, of pointing out its injustice, and protesting against it. That done, we shall dissolve. We shall leave no nucleus whatsoever out of this assembly to form a Church Body to assist in passing this Bill. Neither are we here for the purpose of any compromise. We are not come here to amend Mr. Gladstone's Bill, or to throw out any suggestions respecting it. We condemn it utterly, from first to last, in principle. We look upon it as confiscation; we regard it as assailing the prerogative of the Crown; as unjustly dealing with the property of the subject, and as injuring all property by—for the first time, I believe—destroying what is the best of all titles, that of prescription. I recollect, and I recollect it but dimly—I wish I could remember the exact words—a magnificent illustration of Mr. Plunket's. In some case or other in which the title was defective, he pleaded for prescription, and I think his words were something to this effect, at least this was the figure: he said, that Time was armed with an hour-glass, as well as a scythe. With the scythe, he cut down the muniments of our property, and destroyed the records

of our possession; but with the hour-glass are meted out the hours that give us a better and more assured title. Now, what this Bill does is this: *it denies the justice of the hour-glass, and submits us only to the severity of the scythe.*"

The Earl of Longford moved a resolution embodying an earnest protest against the Bill. In the course of his speech the noble Lord said:—"For argument against this so-called Irish Church Bill, we may refer the Ministers who now advocate it to the former speeches of their former selves. They have been so often quoted that I do not think it necessary to repeat to you extracts on this occasion. But, setting aside the ancient historical arguments, which, we believe, are all entirely in our favour—we may point to them as the enactments of 1801 and of 1829—we can point out to them the book written in 1835,* the Ministerial declaration made by them in Parliament in 1863 and 1865, on which we have been wont to rely as absolute recognitions of the sacred character of the Institution now doomed to destruction. Their answer to that is, that it is all explained by autobiography, that the advancing progress of thought, more mature reflection, the altered circumstances of the times, have produced certain modifications in their views. 'Though we are open to charges of inconsistency,' they say, 'the cause of good government, and the stern sense of public duty

* Mr. Gladstone's book on Church and State, referred to in a former part of this chapter.

which now actuates us, induce us to bring forward this change in the condition of the Church in Ireland, which shall tend to the improvement of the mutual relations of all classes.' Our rejoinder, and I believe it is the only rejoinder we can make, is, *we do not surrender. We do not accept your inevitable. You were right in* 1865; *you are wrong now. We protest against your Bill.*"

The Right Hon. Sir Frederick Shaw, Bart., Recorder of Dublin, said:—"I am an old man, and all my prospects and interests are inseparably connected with the welfare of Ireland, and I sincerely believe that if the three branches of the British Legislature assent to the passing of this Bill to disestablish and disendow the Irish Church, the effect will be to encourage and to aggravate that spirit of disaffection and antagonism to the law which, unhappily, prevails amongst a large portion of our Irish peasantry, and that the rest, with the exception of the Whig and Roman Catholic gentry, who are political adherents of the present Government—and they are comparatively but a handful—that among that influential and intelligent class which has long been conspicuous for loyalty, and have been the habitual supporters of law and order: I do in my heart believe that if the three branches of the Legislature assent to the passing of this Bill, *it will produce among them, generally, a sentiment towards British Law and British Government of distrust and alienation.*"

The Dean of Clonfert (Very Rev. James Byrne,

D.D.) said:—"The modern history of Ireland is mainly a record of alternate rebellion and confiscation; but this is the first time in our annals that rebellion has been followed *by the confiscation of the property of the loyal.* On former occasions it was held that those who had cast off their allegiance to the State might be considered as having forfeited that tenure of their property which the State secured; but now the principle is introduced that when a fraction of the population has risen in revolt, and the revolt has been quelled, the pains and penalties of rebellion are to be inflicted on the most strenuous upholders of order and law. It is now to be adopted as a maxim in our policy that when the enemies of the Queen's Government have been most active in drilling their forces, and collecting their ammunition, and alarming the country with outrage and bloodshed, those on whom that Government has relied in every hour of difficulty and peril as its staunchest and truest friends, are, when the disturbance is past, in order to soothe the disaffected, to be humiliated and despoiled. I ask, my Lords and Gentlemen, what loyalty or security can there be in a country governed on such principles as these? . . . All the elements of Irish discontent will, after the disestablishment of the Church, be as strong as ever, and to them will be added the indignation of the Protestants of Ireland, continually renewed by the long process of spoliation, as in each parish the holders of life interests drop, and the old endowments pass away. Such are the results to secure

which the interests of religion are to be imperilled, the foundations of property shaken, and the very structure of society dislocated, by punishing loyalty and rewarding rebellion. *Against such legislation we protest as reckless and unjust.*"

Dr. Traill, F.T.C.D., said:—"I hope, my Lord, that this day Mr. Gladstone will receive such an answer from our Church throughout the length and breadth of the land; that he will hear such a response from the Giant's Causeway to Cape Clear, such a reverberation from Macgillicuddy's Reeks to the Mountains of Mourne, as will convince him that, all-powerful though he be with his giant majority in the House of Commons, that *though he be gifted with the strength of Samson, while,* we must all admit, *afflicted with his blindness,* he still will find that the Protestants of Ireland will not endeavour to smooth the rugged path upon which he has chosen to enter; but that every obstruction which ingenuity can devise or exasperation can suggest, will be thrown in the way of *this nefarious scheme of robbery and confiscation.*"

I have room for only one more quotation from these really valuable, eloquent, and interesting speeches. It will form, I think, a fitting conclusion to this chapter.

The Lord Bishop of Derry (Right Rev. William Alexander, D.D.) said:—"You remember the famous resolutions of the New England Puritans:

'Resolved—That the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.

'Resolved—That the Lord hath delegated His power to His saints.

'Resolved—That *we* are the saints.'

"Shall we never have three parallel Resolutions?

"Resolved—That the churches of the Irish Protestants are National monuments.

"Resolved—That *we* are the Irish Nation.

"Resolved—That the churches belong to us." Then, after ably criticising some of the clauses of the Bill, his Lordship added:—"While you are Protestants, intensely if you will, Protestants in resisting the usurped Supremacy of Rome, in holding to the Word of God, in believing that we are justified before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in removing every veil between the sinful soul and the Great High Priest; while you are this, hold also to old formularies, unadulterated and unchanged; to the Catholic Faith, to the Catholic Church, in communion with your Bishops and Priests—a threefold cord not easily broken. Then you may be told, that your Church is dead; but she shall only be dead (to use the noble thought, if not the very words, of my great predecessor, Bramhall) as the gold is dead when it is in the furnace, as the sun is dead when he goes down behind the clouds; dead only as the tree is dead when the leaves are swept away in winter. *It shall live, and you with it; drinking from that fountain of life which is in our Incarnate Lord, which is deep as eternity, and inexhaustible as God.*"

## CHAPTER VIII.

### DISESTABLISHMENT.

ON the last day of May, 1869, a majority of *one hundred and fourteen* Members of the House of Commons set the seal of their solemn approval on Mr. Gladstone's plan for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Irish Church. The cheers of the victorious party completely drowned the voice of the Speaker as he put the question, "That this Bill do now pass."

A fortnight later the Bill was introduced into the House of Lords. Many were the opinions expressed as to what would be its fate in the Upper Chamber; but those who were most conversant with the politics of the day predicted that "the Lords would give in," and so they did. Several leading Peers, no doubt—notably the late Earl of Derby—spoke very strongly against the measure; but their arguments failed to convince their opponents. Forty years before, on the 18th March, 1829, Lord Palmerston, speaking in the House of Commons, had expressed himself in these words:—"I never can bring myself to believe that there would at any time be found in this House a sufficiently powerful and numerous Protestant party so profligate in principle, so dead to everything which

would be due to themselves and to their country, as to barter away the religious establishment of any part of the Empire for the gratification of political ambition. But supposing again, this combination of probabilities to occur, and such a vote to be extorted from this House, I trust there would still be found in the other House of Parliament, and, above all, in the indignant feeling of a betrayed people, barriers amply sufficient to protect the Protestant Establishment of the Empire from profanation by such sacrilegious hands."

The lapse of forty years had greatly weakened the strength of the barriers on which Lord Palmerston relied for the protection of the Established Church.

On the second reading of the Bill in the Upper House it was clear that the Government would prove triumphant. Nearly forty Conservative Peers deserted their party, and voted in the majority. Three Peers, however, who were considered to be of Liberal politics voted in the minority. These were Earl Leitrim, who voted as Lord Clements, Viscount Gough, and Lord Blantyre. The Bishop of St. David's voted *for* the Bill; and the Archbishop of Dublin, with fifteen English and Irish Bishops, *against* it. The two English Archbishops and ten English Bishops did not vote on this occasion. Four temporal Peers also abstained from voting.

The division took place in the fullest house which has assembled within living memory, 325 Peers having personally recorded their votes, while 18 paired.

On the 19th June the House went into Committee. It was useless to expect, after the division on the second reading, that the Bill would eventually be thrown out, and therefore the policy adopted by Lord Salisbury, Lord Cairns, and other Peers who sat on the Opposition benches, was to introduce such amendments as would to some extent mitigate the severity of the Bill. In this they only partially succeeded. The Bishop of Peterborough made very great efforts to secure some adequate compensation for the "Minor Incumbents and Curates." His brilliant oratory shed a lustre over every debate, but it did not produce the result which might fairly have been expected. Earl Grey pointed out the consequences which might in the course of time follow in England; and proposed as a remedy the plan of concurrent endowments. "Of all the plans proposed," his Lordship said, "he believed that of building houses, and apportioning a moderate amount of glebe land, would, considering the self-denying habits of the Roman Catholic clergy, afford the greatest amount of practical benefit to them and their flocks, and he now ventured to submit to their Lordships that it was their duty not to let this Bill pass out of their hands without including some system of provision for the Roman Catholic and other religious communities of Ireland. He was persuaded that it was a policy that would tend to the future peace and welfare of that country."

He added:—"Some persons have treated with

scorn the notion that this measure will prove dangerous to the English Church; but he believed that as it now stands it is full of danger to our Established Church. It proceeds on the argument that there is provision for the religion of the majority of the people in England, and likewise for the majority in Scotland; but that in Ireland, where the majority is Roman Catholic, no such provision is to be granted. . . . . When he observed how certain it is that an attack is to be made against our own Church, and when he looked at the frank declarations of the Liberation Society, he confessed it did appear to him a suicidal policy that we should now put into their hands the great advantage of being able to point to a Parliamentary declaration in favour of the soundness of the voluntary principle, and to urge that we ought to deal out to England what has been dealt out to Ireland. He considered this danger the more serious, because he could not forget that a person of no less political influence and command over public opinion than the Prime Minister, in the remarkable pamphlet not long ago published under the title of *A Chapter of Autobiography*, has laid down principles and stated arguments which, if followed to their natural and logical conclusions, must necessarily lead to an attack on the Established Church of this country. And when he considered how rapidly that honourable gentleman's education has gone on under his present allies, both in political and religious opinion, since a few years ago,

when very different views were advocated, he could hardly doubt that if Parliament passes this Bill in its present shape, before many years—probably before many months—we shall see that Right Honourable gentleman at the head of a combined force similar to that which he now leads, at the head of forces which include Cardinal Cullen and Archbishop Manning, Mr. Miall and the Liberation Society, leading the same motley army to an assault on our own Church."

It is doubtful whether the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church would then have accepted, or would now accept, any pecuniary aid for the clergy from the State. At any rate, Earl Grey's proposal was never pressed to an issue. His prediction, however, respecting the assault on the Church of England has been verified. Mr. Spurgeon's Metropolitan Tabernacle has become the Temple of the Liberation Society, and his monthly journal, *The Sword and Trowel*, one of the means by which the opinions of the Society are disseminated. In the number of this journal for April, 1885, under the heading, "A Word in Season to Nonconformists," these words occur:—"With an immensely increased electorate, with two millions of newly enfranchised voters, drawn mainly from the class which has felt the galling tyranny of the Church and the Hall, the Liberation Society, in view of a speedy General Election, has rendered a splendid and timely service to all who are jealous for the crown rights of the Saviour, by its

recent publication of the handbook entitled, *The Case for Disestablishment.*"

Early in July, Earl Granville moved in the House of Lords the third reading of the Bill, upon which the following Protest was entered and signed by forty-seven Peers, temporal and spiritual :—

"*Dissentient.* 1. Because this Bill, for the first time since the foundation of the British monarchy, introduces, so far as Ireland is concerned, the principle, unrecognised in any country in Europe, of an entire severance of the State from the support of any and every form of Religious Worship.

"2. Because the adoption of this principle, with regard to Ireland, cannot but give great encouragement to the designs of those who desire its extension to every part of the United Kingdom.

"3. Because it is a violent stretch of the power of Parliament to resume a grant made by itself in perpetuity; still more to confiscate property held by long prescription, and by a title independent of Parliament.

"4. Because if this principle be well founded, as regards private property, it is still more so with regard to that which has been solemnly set apart for the purposes of religion, and the service of Almighty God.

"5. Because the legislation attempted in this Bill tends to shake confidence in all property, and especially in that which rests upon a Parliamentary title, heretofore considered as the most unassailable of all.

"6. Because it is impossible to place a Church disestablished and disendowed, and bound together only by the tie of a voluntary association, on a footing of equality with the perfect organisation of the Church of Rome, whereby, especially in Ireland, the laity are made completely subservient to the priesthood, the priests to the bishops, and the bishops themselves are subject to the uncontrolled authority of a Foreign Potentate.

"7. Because this Bill will be felt as a grievous injustice by the Protestants of Ireland, who, through their Irish Parliament, surrendered their political independence by a Treaty, the fundamental condition of which was the greater security of the Protestant Establishment.

"8. Because while this measure will tend to alienate those who have hitherto been the firmest supporters of the British Throne and British connection, so far from conciliating, much less satisfying, it will only stimulate to fresh demands that large portion of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland which looks forward to ulterior and very different objects, and, above all, to ultimate emancipation from the control of the British Legislature."

This was a noble protest. It was dignified, it was logical, it was accurate in every statement. But it availed nothing. The "tyrant majority" carried all before it. The voice of reason was drowned. The voice of political party clamour alone was listened to Before the month of July came to a close, the Irish

Church Bill had become a very important part of the Statute Law of the Realm. The preamble stated that it was "expedient that the union created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland, as by law established, should be dissolved, and that the Church of Ireland, as so separated, should cease to be established by law." It was therefore enacted that "on and after *the first day of January*, 1871, the said union, created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland, shall be dissolved, and *the said Church of Ireland shall cease to be established by law*."

About a year and a half was granted to the Church to enable her to make such arrangements as might be rendered necessary by the altered circumstances in which she was placed.

Three "Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland" were appointed under the Act—Viscount Monck, the Right Hon. James Anthony Lawson, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, and George Alexander Hamilton, Esq. Mr. Hamilton died soon after his appointment, and his place was not filled up.

The Commissioners were empowered "to decide all questions whatsoever, whether of law or fact, which it may be necessary to decide for the purposes of the Act."

The 22nd section of the Act states that "if at any time it be shown to the satisfaction of Her Majesty that the bishops, clergy, and laity of the said Church

of Ireland, or the persons who, for the time being, may succeed to the exercise and discharge of the episcopal functions of such bishops, and the clergy and laity in communion with such persons, have appointed any persons or body to represent the said Church, and to hold property for any of the uses or purposes thereof, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by Charter, to incorporate such body, with power, notwithstanding the Statutes of Mortmain, to hold lands to such extent as in this Act provided, but not further or otherwise."

Accordingly, on October 19th, 1870, "THE REPRESENTATIVE CHURCH BODY" was incorporated by Royal Charter. It consists of three classes—Ex-officio Members, Elected Members, and Co-opted Members. The Ex-officio Members are the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church for the time being. The Elected Members consist of one clerical and two lay representatives for each Diocese or Union of Dioceses presided over by one bishop. The Co-opted Members consist of persons equal in number to the number of such Dioceses, for the time being, elected by the Ex-officio and Elected Members. The Elected Members and Co-opted Members retire by rotation, but are eligible for re-election. The total number of members at present is sixty, made up as follows:—Ex-officio, twelve; Elected, thirty-six; and Co-opted, twelve.

The Lord Primate, in the Charge which he delivered to the clergy of Armagh and Clogher, in the

autumn of 1869, gave the following excellent advice:—"To occupy," His Grace said, "the short period that remains to us before the completion of this great transition in vain recriminations or complaints as to the conduct of our adversaries, or the failings of our friends, would be but weakness and folly. The past is irrevocable; it is beyond our power; the present is ours; and to the future we may look with hope if we use that present well. I need not add that in the circumstances of the present there is enough to demand all our energies, and to employ all our exertions."

The Church of Ireland, accordingly, braced up all her energies to make arrangements for her future guidance, and provision for her future maintenance.

The "General Convention" met on Tuesday, February 15th, 1870, in the Antient Concert Rooms, Dublin, to enact laws for the government of the Church in the time to come. After the "Standing Orders" had been passed, the new "Constitution" of the Church was framed; then the draft of the Charter, incorporating the Representative Body (already referred to), received the assent of the Convention, and, finally, several resolutions relating to finance were adopted.

The "Constitution" was preceded by an important Preamble and Declaration. It was declared:—

1. That the Church of Ireland accepts, as heretofore, and unfeignedly believes, all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given

by Inspiration of God, and containing all things necessary to salvation, and continues to profess the faith of Christ, as professed by the *Primitive Church.* That she will continue to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments of the Church, as the Lord hath commanded; and will maintain inviolate the Three Orders of Bishops, Priests, or Presbyters, and Deacons in the Sacred Ministry. But as a Reformed and Protestant Church, she re-affirmed her constant witness against all those innovations in Doctrine and Worship whereby the Primitive Faith has been, from time to time, defaced or overlaid, and which the Church disowned and rejected at the Reformation.

2. That the Church receives and approves the "Thirty-nine Articles" as they had been received and approved in 1634; and approves and adopts the "Book of Common Prayer" as approved and adopted in 1662: and will continue to use the same, subject to such alterations as may be made therein, from time to time, *by the lawful authority of the Church.*

3. That the Church will maintain Communion with the Church of England, and with all other Christian Churches agreeing in the principles of this Declaration.

4. That the General Synod shall have chief legislative power in the Church, and such administrative power as may be necessary for the Church, and consistent with its Episcopal Constitution.

Then followed the "Statute" concerning the General Synod, Diocesan Synods, Parishes, and Parochial

Organisation; of which I can only give here a brief summary.

The General Synod (according to this Statute, which has so far remained unchanged) consists of three distinct Orders, viz., the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity. It consists of *Two Houses*, the House of Bishops, and the House of Representatives. It will be seen that this is analogous to the constitution of the two Houses of Parliament—Lords and Commons. The House of Bishops consists of all the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of Ireland for the time being.

The House of Representatives consists of 208 clerical and 416 lay members.

Every clergyman of the Church of Ireland, who is in priest's orders, is qualified to be elected as a clerical representative, whether he reside in the Diocese for which he may be elected or not.

Every layman of the age of twenty-one years, being a member of the Church, and a *Communicant*, is qualified to be elected as a lay representative for any Diocese.

The members of the House of Representatives all vote together, unless, on a division being called, ten members then present, *of either order*, require by a requisition in *writing* the votes to be taken by *orders;* whereupon the votes are taken accordingly.

Each Diocese has its own Diocesan Synod. The Synod consists of the Bishop, the Beneficed and Licensed Clergymen of the Diocese, and, at least, one

Synodsman for each Parish and District Parochial Church in the Diocese. The number of Synodsmen which each Parish is entitled to return to the Diocesan Synod is *two for each of its officiating clergymen*. Every layman who is twenty-one years of age, a member of the Church, and a Communicant, is qualified to be a Diocesan Synodsman.

The persons entitled to vote at the election of Diocesan Synodsmen are the "Registered Vestrymen" of the Parish.

A Registered Vestryman must be twenty-one years of age, a resident or owner of property in the Parish, and an accustomed member of the congregation attending the Church of the Parish or Parochial District for Divine Worship.

The Register of Vestrymen is revised once in each year, at such time and in such manner as appointed by the Diocesan Synod.

In every Parish there is a "Select Vestry," consisting of the Incumbent and his Curate or Curates (if any), the Churchwardens, and not more than twelve other persons annually elected by the Registered Vestrymen.

Subject to any regulation of the Diocesan Synod, the Select Vestry has the control and charge of Parochial, Charity, and Church Funds; and has to provide from the funds at its disposal all the requisites for Divine Service, and to keep the Church and other Parish buildings in repair.

The foregoing summary will give some idea of the

way in which the General Convention legislated for the government of the Church; and the experience of fifteen years has shown that the Statutes enacted in 1870 were wise and eminently practical.

On October 31st, 1870, His Grace the Duke of Abercorn moved at the Convention:—"That a Committee be appointed to consider whether, without making any such alterations in the Liturgy or Formularies of our Church as would involve or imply a change in her Doctrines, any measures can be suggested calculated to check the introduction and spread of novel doctrines and practices opposed to the principles of our Reformed Church, and to report to the General Synod in 1871."

A Committee was thereupon formed. It consisted of thirteen Clerical and thirteen Lay Members. It was generally known as "Master Brooke's Committee," the Chairman being the late lamented W. Brooke, Esq., Master in Chancery.

An interesting debate arose in the Convention on the "Bishops' Veto;" a clause which empowered a majority of the House of Bishops to reject a measure which had received the approval of the House of Representatives. It was clear that the Bishops' Veto, like the power to withhold the Royal assent from an Act of Parliament, could only and would only be exercised on occasions of the greatest importance, and under a sense of deep responsibility; and yet it was regarded by some with suspicion, and by others with ill-concealed dislike. For a moment the harmony

that had prevailed in the Convention was disturbed; but only for a moment. The Bishops consented to this arrangement: that while a simple majority of both the other Orders should be required to pass a measure, it would require a majority of seven out of the nine Bishops then able to attend the Convention to pass the Episcopal Veto. The 29th clause of the *Draft Constitution* on which this debate turned, as finally amended on the motion of the Duke of Abercorn, ran as follows:—"No question shall be decided except by a majority of the Bishops present (if they should wish to vote on such question), and a majority of the clerical and lay representatives present, whether voting conjointly or separately; provided that no measure shall pass if it have a majority of seven of the Bishops present against it." Subsequently a resolution of the Duke of Abercorn's was agreed to, placing the absolute veto in the hands of two-thirds of the Episcopal Bench present and voting.

A great deal of good resulted from this sifting of the question of episcopal authority to its very foundation. The task of defining that authority in the future Synods of the Church was immensely facilitated; and now it may be said, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that in no Church throughout Christendom are the Bishops more deeply seated in the affections of Churchmen than they are in Ireland. The amount of learning and eloquence displayed throughout the whole of this debate would

have done honour to any legislative assembly in the world. Laymen and clergymen alike vindicated the ancient claim of Ireland to be the land of eloquence, and carried on the discussion with an amount of propriety and good feeling which are not always present when a matter of supreme importance is debated in the British House of Commons.

Another interesting discussion arose on the question of Patronage, and after very careful consideration and debate the plan of the Church of New Zealand was adopted. It has remained unchanged until the present time, and has been found to work on the whole satisfactorily. Appointments to parishes are made by a Board consisting of seven persons: three Diocesan Nominators (two clerical and one lay) appointed by the Diocesan Synod; three Parochial Nominators (lay) appointed by the Parish, with the Bishop as President.

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, reviewing the work of the Convention (March 20th, 1870), said, and said very truly:—"Of the Convention itself we cannot speak too highly. Such a representative assembly has never before been seen in Ireland. It had to contend against singular difficulties. It was a novel and consequently an unorganized and untrained assembly. The subject-matter of its discussions had never, till very lately, occupied the thoughts of many of its members. Let us imagine a House of Commons composed entirely of new members, who had no experience of legislation or of

the forms of the House, and who were summoned to discuss questions which had hitherto lain entirely beyond the region of legislation. Would such an assembly be likely to make as rapid strides in self-government and in effective legislation as the Convention has done? We say, in all sober earnestness, that the Convention will bear comparison in many respects with any popular assembly that has ever existed. It has been, no doubt, noisy and impulsive; but if that be a fault, it is a small one. It has been singularly intolerant of personalities, and no word likely to wound the feelings of any one has escaped in the ardour of debate for which the speaker was not at once called to order by his auditors, while every such slip was sure to be followed by profuse and genuine apologies. In truth, the good done to the Church by the Convention can be measured very imperfectly by its legislative work, though by this, no doubt, it will be judged elsewhere. It has done a service, which we cannot now estimate, in the education of Irish Churchmen. For the first time in their history they have been allowed to bring themselves, their opinions, and their prejudices into the arena of free discussion. And what has been the result? We doubt not that when the dust and heat of these first controversies have passed away, it will be found that barriers apparently insurmountable have been broken down; that prejudices have been dissipated; that we have learned mutual toleration and mutual concession; and that the foundation

has been laid strongly and firmly of a Church Polity, cemented not only by common interests and laws, but by the feelings of indissoluble brotherhood."

This prediction has been abundantly verified in the history of the last fifteen years.

A fact which may well find record here shows that every act of the Convention was watched, and every word noted down, by our brethren in England; and it is gratifying to know, that on the 2nd March, 1870, a letter was read in the Convention, which had been addressed to His Grace the Lord Primate by the two Archbishops of the Church of England. The Archbishops said:—"We beg to assure you that our efforts shall not be wanting, whenever you may call upon us, to render such assistance on this side of the Channel as we may be able to do to our beloved sister Church. We have hitherto abstained from any public action in the matter, deeming it best that the Church in Ireland should first frame her Constitution, and should then suggest to us the manner in which we may best serve her interests. But we have watched with sincere sympathy all that has passed amongst you; and we are sure that we express a feeling that is wide-spread and deep in the English people, when we wish you every blessing and support from above, and when we assure you that we shall always regard the members of the Church of Ireland with sincere love as our brethren in Christ, united to us by a strong bond of a common faith and hopes of salvation."

To this letter was appended an address, signed by the Archbishops, by Lord Devon, Lord Rutland, and 3,777 other members of the Church of England.

The General Convention brought its work to a close before the end of April, 1870. At this critical period in her history, the Church of Ireland had good reason to be proud of her bishops; but especially had she reason to be thankful to God that the Primatial See of Armagh was filled by such a man as Archbishop Beresford. With his three-score and ten years upon him, he looked the very picture of the Hebrew Lawgiver of old. "His eyes were not dim, nor was his natural force abated." Those who heard his eloquent speech on the mode of appointing to the Primacy in the future, a question beset with difficulties, will not soon forget it. The rapturous applause which greeted the conclusion of it gave ample evidence that the hearts, as well as the minds, of his hearers had been influenced by what he had said. The Archbishop of Dublin (Right Rev. Dr. Trench) did not, by any means, use exaggerated language when, on the last day of the session, he said:—"We must all have admired the readiness, the ability, the gallant manner in which the Primate acted, whatever was his own view; and the way in which he clearly showed how deeply penetrated he is with the solemn obligation of the episcopal office which he holds."

One great and important step had been taken. Careful preparation had been made to meet the changes which the lapse of a few months would not

fail to bring about: and Archbishop Trench, when returning thanks for himself and the Primate, and bringing the proceedings of the Convention to a close, struck a key-note of hope for the future. He said:—"It is now something for us to have taken our share in such a meeting as this has been, and whatever are the issues, may God grant that they shall be all that we desire and venture to hope. No one can deny that they are issues which will make themselves felt in this Church of Ireland; will make themselves felt, not merely for ourselves, but for many generations after we have passed away. No doubt, our work, the work of man, has the marks of human infirmity cleaving to it; no doubt, none of us have had all our will here, none of us have seen everything done that we desired to do; yet, I believe we shall return to our homes determined and resolved to make the very best of everything; determined that the Church of Ireland, by God's blessing, shall work with her new Constitution for the blessing of the present, and many coming generations of our people."

Early in the year 1870 (January 28th), the Irish Church lost one of her bishops—the Right Rev. Hamilton Verschoyle, D.D., Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin, and Ardagh. He died at Torquay, where he had been ordered to spend the winter months on account of his delicate health. Bishop Verschoyle was the eldest son of J. Verschoyle, Esq., of Stillorgan House, Co. Dublin. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin; obtained a Scholarship in 1823;

and proceeded B.A. in 1825; M.A., B.D., and D.D. in 1862. He was appointed Curate of Clongish (Newtownforbes, Co. Longford) in 1829; and Incumbent of the Episcopal Chapel, Baggot Street, Dublin, in 1835. This post he held for twenty-seven years. His ministry in Dublin was greatly valued, and he is now, and will long be, held in affectionate remembrance by many friends. In 1862 he was appointed Dean of Ferns, and the same year he was consecrated to the See of Kilmore, in Kilmore Cathedral, by the Archbishop of Dublin (Whately), and the Bishops of Killaloe (Fitzgerald) and Cashel (Daly). He lived to preside over his three United Dioceses only seven years. He died at the age of sixty-seven. By his death the revenues of the See of Kilmore, amounting to the gross value of £6,856 a-year, were lost to the Church, and went to swell the amount of which she was deprived by the Irish Church Act. Besides that, the new bishop could not be appointed by the Diocesan Synod of Kilmore, as it could not come into existence until January 1st, 1871. All that could be done was to petition the Crown to appoint a bishop temporarily, the petition to be presented by the Primate, or by three of the bishops of the Province, but the bishop (*locum tenens*) was not to be entitled to the emoluments of the See beyond the first of January. The net value of the See was £5,255.

A petition *was* presented to the Crown, and by a "Queen's letter," the Rev. C. Leslie, the eldest son of

a former bishop of the Diocese, was appointed. He was at the time Rector of Drung, in the Co. Cavan. His income, after the first of January, was made dependent on the will of the General Synod. Bishop Leslie only lived to enjoy his new dignity three months. He was succeeded by the Very Rev. Dr. Carson, Dean of Kilmore and Vicar-General, who was also appointed, by a Queen's letter, on the recommendation of the Primate.

I would willingly, if I could do so, at this point in my narrative, pass over all mention of a painful controversy which convulsed the whole Church of Ireland during the Spring of 1870; but I should, in that case, be charged with unfairness. The impartial historian must, sometimes, record facts to which it is painful to refer. An insignificant little book, written by an English clergyman, entitled, *Short Prayers for those who have little time to pray*, was placed in the hands of a young servant girl, attending a confirmation class, by a Dublin clergyman, who is undoubtedly one of the ablest, most devoted, and most conscientious among the many able, devoted, and conscientious clergy of the Church of Ireland. The book is popularly known as *Portal's Manual*. It was, to say the least, an incautious act; for the Manual does contain statements which are entirely at variance with the opinions commonly accepted as true by the members of all Protestant Churches. If a few simple and kindly words of remonstrance had been addressed to the

giver of the book, and the objectionable passages pointed out, there can be no doubt that it would at once have been withdrawn from circulation, and the world would have heard no more about it. But instead of this course being adopted, public attention was drawn to the Manual through the newspapers, and, in the course of a few weeks, thousands of copies were flying about all over the country, doubtless to the intense delight of the publishers; meetings were held in nearly every country parish, country squires, village shopkeepers, and small farmers suddenly developed into learned theologians; speeches were made, petitions were drawn up, protests were signed, and such a ferment was kept up that, at one time, it seemed as if the excitement would become greater than it had been even during O'Connell's agitation for the Repeal of the Union.

This, however, was not all. It was sought to elicit from Archbishop Trench an *ex cathedrâ* opinion on the objectionable phrases or passages which the Manual certainly contains. Nothing could be more unfair, when it is recollected that this little book formed no part of the authorized formularies of the Church of Ireland; and moreover, it really is possible, by the exercise of a little Christian charity, to explain those passages in such a way as to deprive them of a good deal of their poison. Besides, an expression of opinion delivered by a private and irresponsible person, is something very different from a judgment delivered by a responsible dignitary of a

Church, on a matter quite outside the teaching of the Church, as contained in her recognized Articles and Forms of Devotion.

A Protest, to which a very large number of most respectable signatures was attached, was forwarded to the Archbishop; and when that Protest is read, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that those who signed it were influenced by the highest and purest of motives. There was undoubtedly a sense of alarm and insecurity, but it was hardly justifiable under the circumstances. The Archbishop's reply was, as might have been expected, firm and dignified, and at the same time calculated to dispel all alarm. He, doubtless, felt that in avoiding one extreme it was possible to fall into another. "*Incidit in Scyllam, qui vult vitare Charybdim.*" I quote only the concluding words of the reply. His Grace said:—"For myself I can only say, that I would a hundred times sooner cease from the office which I hold, than become the ignoble instrument of narrowing the limits of our Church, and making untenable in it the position of many of its most earnest and devoted children."

I cannot better conclude this portion of my subject than by quoting a few passages from a leading article which appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, on May 23rd, 1870; and I am neither afraid nor ashamed to say, even at the risk of being misunderstood in some quarters, that I give the following quotation because I thoroughly endorse it.

The *Gazette* said :—" It is with pain and regret we have witnessed the unmanly, unchurchmanlike, and, worse than all, unchristian attacks which have been made on this estimable Prelate of the Irish Church [Archbishop Trench]. The Archbishop, whether rightly or wrongly, refused to narrow the limits of our Church beyond what is required by the language of her authorized formularies, and for this and for not recognizing the interpretation put upon certain passages quoted from *Portal's Manual*, in the now famous Protest, as quite fair either towards the *Manual* in question or the Prayer Book, he has been overwhelmed with an amount of obloquy, unprecedented in the history of religious controversy."

The *Gazette* further said :—" No one, we suppose, will doubt for a moment the Protestantism of that distinguished Irish Churchman, Professor Jellett" [now Provost of Trinity College], " whose eloquent voice was ever raised on the side of the Protestant people of Ireland during the many debates that took place in the Convention. Yet, Professor Jellett, in a sermon preached by him at the Advent Special Services in St. Patrick's Cathedral last year, gave counsel that might well have been followed by some of those who have joined in the popular tumult against the Archbishop. His prescient mind only too truly foresaw a danger to the Church in her newly-found liberty, which has since been unhappily realized. He was speaking on the subject of ' The

Church of Ireland, a Catholic Church.' 'I have no fear,' he said, 'for the Protestantism of the Irish Church, but I do think that her Catholicity is in some danger.' 'At such a crisis,' he went on to say, 'I should ill discharge my duty if I did not warn you that we have always to dread the upspringing of a despotism, as bad as any despotism, I mean *the despotism of a majority*. We have to fear that the representatives of one school of religious thought, finding themselves to be the most powerful, may desire to have exclusive possession of the Church, and to banish from it, by some new system of tests, by articles more numerous and more rigidly defined, every form of thought but their own. . . . . Perhaps you may think that there are points of doctrine upon which the Church ought to have pronounced a sentence more decisive; perhaps you may feel confident enough in the truth of your own belief to deny even plausibility to that of your opponents; and it may be that those who think with you are strong enough to procure an authoritative declaration, rendering acquiescence in your creed essential to admission into the Church. But before you take that almost irrevocable step, I ask you to think earnestly and prayerfully of what you are doing. Can you say that on the question which separates you from your brother Protestant, a right belief is necessary to salvation? And if you cannot, are you justified in driving from your communion, *for that*, men who are serving the same Master as bravely and as

faithfully as you are? And are you justified in doing what in you lies to degrade to the position of a sect, that Church which has so long gloried, and rightly gloried, in the name of *Catholic?*'"

I may be pardoned for quoting here a few words from a pamphlet which, soon after the Portal Manual controversy had subsided, was published by another distinguished Irish Churchman, the Rev. Dr. Salmon, Regius Professor of Divinity, Trinity College. It was entitled, "Thoughts on the Present Crisis of the Church of Ireland."

Dr. Salmon said:—"If we exhibit ourselves unable to keep together the moment we are freed from State control, wrangling among ourselves, and splitting up into new sects, it will seem to have been proved by experiment that private judgment is essentially anarchical: and those who might have been induced to cast off the Papal yoke *will resign themselves to it with a sigh, as their only security against endless schism.*"

I willingly turn to a more agreeable subject. Just before the year 1870 came to a close, the restored Cathedral of St. Fin Barre, Cork, was consecrated. It was in every respect a noteworthy event. There were present the two Archbishops of the Irish Church, and the Bishops of Meath, Down, Limerick, Derry, and Tuam; and with them, one who, although a Bishop of the Church of England, is a very eminent Irishman, the Right Rev. Dr. Magee, Bishop of Peterborough. The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, in an

article describing the ceremonial (December 23rd, 1870), said:—"The proceedings, on the last day of November, and the first two days of the present month, certainly, gave no intimation that our Church had suffered so seriously through Disestablishment and Disendowment, that her recovery in the future was problematical. On the contrary, there was a hopefulness, a conscious self-reliance, in all that took place during those three memorable days that must inspire much confidence for the future. No words of despair, or of craven fear, were uttered; there were no vain and useless regrets for the past; no timid counsels for the morrow. More than one of the Right Rev. preachers took a wise advantage of the occasion to press upon their audience the duty of self-denial in the cause of their Church, and we are sure their words were not thrown away. More than this was hardly said that in any degree bore upon the present circumstances of the Church."

The *Guardian*, which does not always exhibit a friendly spirit towards the Church of Ireland, noticed the event in these words:—"On Wednesday last, the Feast of St. Andrew, this noble Cathedral—the noblest that has been raised by any Reformed Church since the Reformation—was consecrated to the service of God. It is now nearly six years since the foundation-stone was laid by the present Bishop of Cork"—Right Rev. John Gregg, D.D.—"and he has had the happiness of being permitted to consecrate the building toward the erection of which his exertions

and his liberality have largely contributed. It was a day to be long and thankfully remembered, not only by the Diocese over which that prelate presides, but by the whole Church of Ireland; and while the Churchmen of Cork assembled in crowds to witness the solemn ceremony, nearly every Diocese in Ireland was represented by its Bishop. Nor was the sister Church of England unrepresented on the occasion. The Bishop of Peterborough, a native of Cork,* who had been Dean of Cork when the foundation of the Cathedral was laid, and during the early years of its building, responded to the invitation of the Bishop, and came to assist at the consecration. He had shared in the difficulties which beset the commencement of this work, and he shared in the triumph of its completion."

Before I make a fresh start in this Historical Sketch, I am anxious again to impress on all my readers that we claim for this old Church of ours the distinctive title, "*Church of Ireland*," and we have good ground (so at any rate we think) on which to base our claim. The question is not one of numbers; it is not affected by the circumstance of our being in the minority when compared with the whole population of Ireland. The question is one of historical continuity; and

* This statement is not quite accurate. The Bishop of Peterborough is a son of the late Rev. John Magee, Rector of St. Peter's, Drogheda, and grandson of Archbishop Magee, formerly Archbishop of Dublin, and author of the well-known book on "The Atonement."

that continuity has remained unbroken since the days of St. Patrick. So lately as the year 1879 our right to call ourselves members of the Church of Ireland was denied by Mr. O'Neill Daunt, who stated in a letter to the *Freeman's Journal* that Church property was violently wrenched from the old Establishment and transferred to the new; and a Roman Catholic Priest, about the same time, asserted at a Limerick Home Rule dinner that his Hierarchy had been here for fourteen hundred years.

To these assertions a satisfactory reply was given by a well-known Irish clergyman, the Rev. Charles Crosthwaite, M.A., Canon and Vicar-General of Kildare, formerly Prebendary and Rector of Rathangan. The initials, C. C., V.G., appended to the clever letters which constantly appear in the daily and weekly newspapers, are as well known as those of that delightful Essayist, A. K. H. B., whose books have been read by thousands of readers, and whom the initiated know to be a very able and eminent minister of the Presbyterian (Established) Church of Scotland.

Canon Crosthwaite deals with the whole question of the succession of Irish bishops in a most satisfactory manner. A few passages from his pamphlet, "Which Church has Orders from St. Patrick?" will form a very appropriate conclusion to this portion of my subject.

In dealing with the case before him, Canon Crosthwaite very properly lays this down as an axiom

to clear the way:—"Theological questions and historical truth are two matters quite distinct." We have to decide not whether the bishops of the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth held correct views of Scripture—many of them, probably, did not—but whether they were episcopally descended from their predecessors. It is entirely a question of history, not of theology.

Bearing this in mind, the Canon says:—"To discuss the question as to whether the Marian Bishops—that is, those whom Elizabeth found on her accession—continued to act as bishops afterwards, we may divide them into two classes—(1) Those appointed by Mary. (2) Those appointed by Henry VIII. after his breach with Rome, or by Edward. All the latter class, we may presume, after their former changes, were ready enough for another. We need not, therefore, ask about any but the twelve of Mary's own appointment. Of these we know two—Walsh, of Meath, and Leverons, of Kildare—were deprived.* This leaves only ten to be accounted for. One of these was Curwen, of Dublin. Of him we need not speak. He was thoroughly Protestant, and was soon removed to Oxford. We have only nine left: viz., Ardagh, Clonmacnoise, Leighlin, Ossory, Cashel, Cork, Killaloe, Limerick, and Ross."

The Canon goes on to show that these prelates retained their places and their emoluments under

* This fact I have already stated in a previous chapter.

Elizabeth; and that whatever may have been their motives or their opinions, the historical continuity of the Church was thus preserved. "I have called on Rome in vain," he adds, "to connect her present bishops with the line of St. Patrick. I have shown that all the bishops whom Mary left in the Irish Church, except two, conformed under Elizabeth. I have no more to do until a single line is produced on the other side. If it could be shown that every single conforming bishop were a hypocritical Romanist in disguise, it would not weaken our orders. Intention is not a matter that we rely on. If a man plays the part of a hypocrite, the guilt rests not with those whom he deceives, but with the Creed to which he belongs—still more if it sanctions his dishonesty."

The separation of this ancient Church from the State has not produced the results which were anticipated. Disestablishment has *not* produced peace, contentment, and prosperity in Ireland. So far from doing so, it has brought about a condition of civil discord, dissatisfaction, and misery; for political agitators now see plainly that they have only to shout long and loud enough to get all they want. The attack on the Church is, after all, only a means to an end, that end being the confiscation of all private property. Mr. Gladstone fastened upon the term, "last badge of ascendancy," to try and satisfy himself and his followers that he was doing right in depriving the Church of Ireland of her

worldly *status* and of her property. But what have we had during the last fifteen years instead of the so-called "ascendancy" of the Church? We have had the ascendancy of a lawless rabble, the intolerable tyranny of the Land League, followed by the National League; we have had the legalized robbery of the classes who owned the land for the benefit of those who tilled it; we have had the ascendancy of the revolver and the bowie-knife used to carry out the hellish purposes of the "Invincibles." This is all that Ireland has gained, socially and politically, by the Irish Church Act of 1869.

The late Earl Cairns foresaw and predicted all this. Speaking in the House of Lords on June 24th, 1867, in reply to Earl Russell, who had called for an "Inquiry into the Revenues of the Irish Church," Lord Cairns concluded an eloquent and exhaustive speech in these words:—"I think I have now established this position—that this is an agitation which proceeds not from Ireland, not from Roman Catholics as against Protestants, but one which proceeds from those who are opposed to all ecclesiastical establishments as against those who are in favour of such establishments. . . . . We have sources of dissension enough, God knows, between Roman Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, and I beseech your Lordships not to make this another of them. Look back for a moment on the history of the Church question in that country. About thirty years ago you had heart-rending accounts, day by day, of collisions between

the peasantry and the soldiery, and of assaults, loss of life, riot, and disorder, all directly occasioned by the collisions to which I have referred arising out of the collection of tithes. But wise legislation put an end to that sad state of things, and for nearly a quarter of a century there has been perfect peace and quiet throughout the country so far as that subject is concerned. The Church property has been so completely isolated, that it cannot become the cause of collisions between different classes of the inhabitants. The glebe lands are peaceably occupied by the clergy, the tithe rent-charge is paid by the landlords, and improvements have been introduced in regard to bishops' leases. But you are now asked to re-open a question pregnant with all the consequences which I have endeavoured to point out. My Lords, because I feel the gravity of these objections to the scheme of the noble Earl; because I see in its conception, *injustice*, and even *confiscation*, and in its execution, *strife*—bitter and enduring strife and animosity; and because, above all, I see in its result insecurity to property, and peril—perhaps not immediate, but not the less certain—peril to the Established Church in this country, I beseech your Lordships to give no assent, and no encouragement, to the motion of the noble Earl in its present form."

This warning was unheeded. The revolutionary spirit of the age demanded a victim. Exactly two years after, Lord Cairns was engaged in a vain endeavour to lessen as much as possible the severity

of the blow which the so-called "Liberal" party in both Houses of Parliament had determined to inflict on the ancient Church of Ireland. The whole strength of that party was put forth. Might triumphed over right; and as the last stroke of the clock sounded twelve on the night of December 31st, 1870, the Church of Ireland ceased "to be by Law Established."

## CHAPTER IX.

### RECONSTRUCTION.

WHEN the sun set on the last day of 1870, a hard frost prevailed over a very large area in Ireland. The frost continued for several hours; but *just at midnight* a thaw set in, and the ice suddenly disappeared. Next day, the following beautiful verses were written by an Irish lady, whose poetry, as we all know, abounds in what Matthew Arnold calls "sweetness and light"—Mrs. Henry Faussett, (Alessie Bond).

### SET FREE.*

"But as for me, I will come into Thy house in the multitude of Thy mercy: and in Thy fear will I worship toward Thy holy temple."—*Psalms for the Day.*

"Frozen and chill'd and stranded, they said, with an icy sneer—
Black as yon tide her heavens—she will go with the dying year:
But the angel came at midnight, and the grasp of ice gave o'er,
And the ship moved onward grandly to her deeps from the inland shore!

* These words have been set to excellent music by Rev. A. C. Neely, M.A., with accompaniments by C. McKorkell, Esq., and published by Cramer, Wood, & Co., Belfast.

"The angel came at midnight, but not with the voice of death,
While the last of the twelve was tolling, the land felt a living breath:
Through the wintry dawn came a promise of the summer of life to be—
One chain that had bound her was broken, and Ireland's Church was free.

"Thousands of voices blending, pray'd the Helmsman still to keep
Her course from the hidden shallows, through the dangers of the deep.
I heard and I knew there were dangers, but my heart rose o'er their care,
With the bound of the glorious vessel, on the mighty wave of prayer!

"And they echoed the old Psalm's music—'We will go to Thy house, O Lord,
In the multitude of Thy mercy.' We praise Thee with glad accord!
In the might of Thy Spirit's blessing we will suffer and work for Thee,
Till Thou bring our ship to anchor at the mouth of the crystal sea."

The Church of Ireland had, indeed, been set free on a new career, a new mission of love to the land in which she was planted fourteen hundred years ago.

On the 1st January, 1871, the Hon. and Rev. W. C. Plunket (now Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin) preached a Sermon in St. Patrick's Cathedral, which was afterwards published under the title, "The Hour

is Come." "Like everything Mr. Plunket writes," was the comment of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, "there is a fervid energy in this sermon, and the same earnest claim for our Church as the *National Church of Ireland*, which we have met elsewhere in his public addresses. Mr. Plunket is not one of those who despair of the Church of Ireland; on the contrary, he looks forward to a brighter and more efficient history than ever, yet to be hers."

In the middle of March, a mandate was issued by the Lord Primate, convening the General Synod, and on Thursday, April 13th, the Synod met for the first time.

One question soon forced itself to the front, and that was the question of "Revision." We have already seen, that on the motion of the Duke of Abercorn, "Master Brooke's Committee" was appointed by the General Convention. That Committee drew up and presented to the General Synod a valuable Report, which was published and widely circulated. Some of the daily papers stupidly called the Report "Master Brooke's Pamphlet."

The Report, after quoting the Duke of Abercorn's Resolution, which I have given in the chapter immediately preceding this, says:—"The limits of the task entrusted to us are here very clearly indicated. We were commissioned to consider and suggest such measures (and such measures only) as might tend to check, in the Church of Ireland, the introduction or spread of modern Ritualism. Alterations or addi-

tions, however valuable in themselves, which have no such tendency, are excluded from the field of our inquiry. Moreover, even if we should be of opinion that a certain alteration in the Liturgy or Formularies *would* tend to check the growth of Ritualism, we are forbidden to suggest such an alteration, if it should involve or imply any change in the Doctrines of our Church. . . . . The field of our investigation being thus defined, we had in the next place to inquire, What *are* the 'novel doctrines and practices' whose introduction into the Church of Ireland it is desired to check? And here we would observe, that the two classes of errors indicated, respectively, by the words 'Doctrines' and 'Practices' differ widely in the kind of importance which attaches to them. Doctrines are important in themselves, and for their own sake. Practices are important, chiefly, because they symbolize doctrines; and therefore, in considering these errors and their appropriate remedies, it is desirable to commence with the doctrine in which the practice originates, and to view the symbolizing practice principally with regard to the doctrine."

The Report further said:—"Before proceeding to consider more particularly the doctrines against which the Resolution of the Duke of Abercorn was pointed, we would observe, that it is no part of our duty to argue the question of their truth or falsehood on grounds derived from Scripture, or from the teaching of the Early Church. It is enough for the discharge of our present task if we can show that these doc-

trines are 'opposed to the principles of our Reformed Church.' And no true member of our Church will need to be convinced that a doctrine which *is* thus opposed is neither *Scriptural* nor *Apostolic*."

The Report then deals with the subject of what is commonly called *Sacerdotalism*. "The doctrines," it says, "which form the basis of Ritualism as held by a certain party in the Church of England, and which the vast majority of Irish Churchmen desire to exclude from the Church of Ireland, are marked by one general character, namely, that they result in the ascription to the priesthood of powers which do not belong to that office. This result, which is commonly indicated by the name Sacerdotalism, has two principal sources, both of which have engaged the anxious attention of your Committee."

The first of these sources is stated to be that which has reference to "the power of the priest in the administration of the Lord's Supper;" and the second to "the power of the priest in the forgiveness of sins." Under these two divisions of the subject the Committee presented to the General Synod a great deal of valuable information.

The conclusion arrived at, as regards the Doctrines of the Church, was stated in these words:—"It was our duty, throughout the whole of our task, to remember that the subject of this inquiry is a book, regarded by the vast majority of Churchmen with a veneration and a love second only to that which they feel for the Bible itself. These feelings are evoked

and sustained, not only by its own surpassing merits, but by the associations which link it with all our devotional feelings, even from childhood. That noble Liturgy, in which our Church has, for centuries, taught us to embody our supplications to God, commands the affections of her members with a power unrivalled, probably, by any other human composition, and any violent change, even if it were a change for the better, *which is in the highest degree improbable*, could not fail to shock the minds of all. Even small alterations would be generally unwelcome. We, therefore, entered upon our task with a determination not to recommend any change in the formularies of devotion, unless such a change should appear to be absolutely necessary to the performance of the task entrusted to us. We are happy to say that no such necessity appeared to exist. Accordingly, we have not recommended change *in any prayer or exhortation which is to be found in any general service.* The only alterations in the text of any of our services which we have ventured to suggest are the omission of the Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick, a form which we believe to be very rarely used; and the substitution of another form for one at present in use in the Ordination of Priests."

The Report then deals with "Practices;" and after a brief but very lucid treatment of this branch of the subject, the conclusion arrived at is expressed in these words:—"We would observe here, that without impairing her comprehensive character, the Church

may insist upon a much more complete uniformity in matters of practice and ritual than in matters of doctrine. In the one case, she requires *belief;* in the other, she only requires *conformity.* She requires her members to *believe* that the Articles which embody her Creed are *the* truth. But in prescribing a Ritual, she does not require them to express any opinion as to its merits; and, therefore, unless the ritual express a doctrine which the clergyman to whom it is prescribed believes to be untrue, he is quite justified in using it, even though he should think another form to be superior to that which the Church has ordained."

The Committee were not unanimous in their adoption of this Report. There were some who dissented from some portions of it. The names of the dissentients, and their reasons, are given at the end of this valuable document.

We shall see as we proceed, that the doctrines and practices referred to in the Report were examined and thoroughly discussed by the General Synod, and that the result was to leave the Prayer Book almost exactly as it was before the debates commenced; a few trivial alterations were rendered absolutely necessary by the altered circumstances of the Church; but these changes were so few, and so unimportant, that every true-hearted Churchman may now raise his heart and his voice in grateful thanks to God, who, in a moment of peril, intervened and preserved to the Church of Ireland her ancient faith, and the

Scriptural form of words in which that faith is expressed. If the so-called "Revisionist party" had proved victorious in the strife, the ancient Church of this country would, by this time, have ranked only as one of the innumerable "sects" of Christendom.

Another question with which the General Synod, at an early stage in its history, had to deal, was the question of *Finance*.

It was quite clear that by the operation of the Irish Church Act, the Church would be compelled to fall back for her future support almost entirely on voluntary contributions. It was therefore suggested, and the suggestion was acted upon, that there should be a Central Sustentation Fund to be administered by the Representative Body. There were, however, intricate problems to solve connected with "Commutation" and "Composition." These problems were solved in the most satisfactory manner by members of the Representative Body, whose skill in finance has elicited the admiration of all who are competent to be judges of the results which they have achieved, and whose unswerving fidelity and integrity have been without a parallel in the history of any church or nation. Unselfish, self-sacrificing, indefatigable in doing the work which they undertook to do, these men have set an example which might well be followed by those who are entrusted with the management of funds employed for the benefit of the State. The suggestions or recommendations of the Representative Body were communicated from

time to time to the General Synod, and having received the assent of the Synod, they became thenceforward an integral part of the Statute Law, so to speak, of the Church.

The "Resolutions in connection with Commutation and Compounding" deserve special mention.

The 23rd section of the Irish Church Act declares that after the 1st day of January, 1871, the clergy may apply to the Commissioners of Church Temporalities to commute their annuities and value of life interests in any kind of ecclesiastical property, and that the Commissioners, in case the Representative Body assent to such Commutation, shall pay the amount of the estimated value to the Representative Body, charged with the payment of the annuities and life interests thus commuted to the respective annuitants, so long as they shall require the same. By the same section the Commissioners were bound to pay to the Representative Body 12 *per cent.*, in addition to the estimated value, provided that not less than three-fourths of the ecclesiastical persons of a diocese or united diocese agree to commute before the 1st day of January, 1873. This arrangement was fully carried out.*

By the same section of the Act power was given to the Representative Body to make such arrangements in respect of the commuted value of the

* During the financial year ended March 1st, 1873, the Commutation Committee held 85 meetings, and disposed of over 2,800 cases.

annuity with the annuitant, and as to the disposal of such portion thereof as shall, after such arrangements, be applicable to Church purposes, as shall to such Body seem fit. By this transaction, commonly called Compounding or Composition, the Commutation Money of each clergyman who desired it was divided into two parts, one becoming immediately the property of the said clergyman, and the other being vested in the Representative Body for the benefit of the Church.

This, too, was done in many cases where it appeared to be desirable.

There was a third arrangement. In the case of a clergyman who commuted, but did not compound, the Representative Body advanced, when it was required, so much of the Commutation Money as was agreed upon on the security of his annuity, on certain terms set forth in what was known as Table III.; or in case of his assigning to the Representative Body an approved policy of insurance on his life, the clergyman received a sum of money at 4 per cent. interest, in addition to the premium payable on the policy.

This was known as "borrowing under Table III." The whole financial plan worked admirably, and gave general satisfaction.

Connected with the subject of Finance was the case of a very large number of hardworking and underpaid clergymen, the "Minor Incumbents," and similar to theirs, the case of many deserving Curates.

The Minor Incumbents were clergymen, many of them of long standing in the ministry, who, when the Irish Church Act passed, were not in a better position, so far as emolument was concerned, than they had been as Stipendiary Curates, whilst the fact that they were Incumbents having sole charges involved them in much expense from which, as Curates, they had been exempt. Believing that they had a National guarantee for the fulfilment of every reasonable expectation which the Established Church held out to them, they were content to spend many years in toiling hard on a very small income. They felt no doubt that sooner or later the day would come when they would be appointed to Benefices with larger stipends; and they patiently waited for the time when they would be freed from the harassing anxiety which is inseparable from genteel poverty. The Irish Church Act came down like a thunderbolt on the heads of these excellent men; for it proposed simply to stereotype their poverty, and make it lifelong. The Act respected their "vested interests;" but the framers of the Act conveniently forgot that among their vested interests was to be reckoned the reasonable prospect of promotion.

When an officer receives a commission in the army as a subaltern, he looks forward to promotion in due time. He expects, if he lives long enough, to become a Colonel, perhaps, a General; and if he be a very ambitious man, he may, perhaps, dream of attaining the rank of a Field-Marshal. Suppose some

day the army were disbanded in consequence of the prevalence of the principles of the "Peace Society;" that officer would feel very much aggrieved if such language as this were used to him:—"You have served your country faithfully and well, in the position of a subordinate. You shall henceforward receive the small pittance, in the shape of pay, which you have been accustomed to receive; but as to your future prospects, we cannot possibly take them into account. You entered the service of Her Majesty, no doubt, with reasonable expectations of advancement; but expectations are often disappointed, and you must not complain. We did not think it likely, a few years ago, that the necessity for a standing army would cease; but political and other changes have driven us to the conclusion that the army must now be disbanded. Of course, your 'vested interests' will be taken into consideration, and we hope you will give us no further trouble, but submit like a good Christian unrepiningly to your fate."

This was precisely the kind of language used to the Minor Incumbents and Curates of the Church of Ireland in 1869. An Association, with a good working Committee, was thereupon formed to defend their rights; and for nearly seven years every effort was made to establish those rights. There was little or no success. Then the whole matter was allowed to drop for a time. Subsequently, a new Association was formed, in order to obtain from Parliament, for these ill-used clergymen, a portion of the Irish

Church Surplus, which was then being lavished on several objects of a useful, but of a purely secular, character. The new Association seemed at one moment likely to achieve success. A short Bill, supplementary to the Irish Church Act, was introduced into the House of Commons by the Hon. David Plunket, one of the members for the University of Dublin, and was read the first time. Shortly after this, the ministry of Lord Beaconsfield went out of office. Mr. Gladstone again became Prime Minister; and the Minor Incumbents' and Curates' Association, finding success hopeless, ceased to make any further effort to remedy the terrible injustice inflicted by the Act of 1869 on a very large number of the Irish Clergy.

Early in 1872 the Irish Church lost one of her veteran Bishops, the Right Rev. Robert Daly, D.D., Bishop of Cashel. Bishop Daly was the son of the Right Hon. Denis Daly, of Dunsandle. His mother was the daughter of the first Lord Farnham. He was born in 1783, so that at the time of his death he was nearly ninety years of age. Some years ago, at a meeting of the Church Education Society, the late Bishop O'Brien, of Ossory, made one of his lucid and logical speeches in defence of the principles of the Society. He was then seventy-six or seventy-seven years of age, and he felt it necessary to apologise to his audience for appearing on the platform, as he was getting, he said, too old to take the part that he had formerly taken at public meetings. His speech,

certainly, gave no evidence of failure of intellect. When, however, Bishop Daly rose to second the Resolution that had been moved by his brother prelate, he began with these words:—"I have listened with very great pleasure to the speech of *my dear young friend*, the Bishop of Ossory." Thunders of applause drowned the voice of the aged Bishop for some minutes; for he was nearly ten years older than Bishop O'Brien, and yet there he stood firm as the Rock that towers above the Cathedral City of his Diocese of Cashel; and he proceeded to deliver an address so hearty, so full of zeal, so brimful of simple and natural eloquence, that all who heard him were filled with admiration of the fine old man. Truly "there were giants in those days."

Bishop Daly was taken to his heavenly rest, as I have said, in the spring of 1872.

For the first time in her history—at any rate since 1172—the Church of Ireland was called upon to elect a Bishop by popular suffrage. There were three names put prominently forward. The Rev. Dr. Bell, Rector of Tipperary, afterwards Archdeacon of Cashel; Very Rev. Dr. Macdonnell, then Dean of Cashel; and Very Rev. Dr. Maurice Day, then Dean of Limerick.

The choice of the Synod fell upon the last-named clergyman, the present Bishop. On the 14th April, 1872, the Bishop was consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral, the sermon being preached by the Rev. Achilles Daunt, B.D. (afterwards Dean of Cork),

who had succeeded the Bishop some years before as Incumbent of St. Matthias' Church, Dublin.

The occasion was not only a solemn one, but one which called for deep thankfulness to Almighty God from the lips of all true-hearted Irish Churchmen. A great experiment had been tried, and it had proved eminently successful. It was the first time that the scheme framed by the General Convention had been put to the test, and it proved more than equal to the strain placed upon it. Fears were expressed in some quarters that the first popular election of a Bishop might be marred by unruly proceedings, or by hot or ill-judged words; but neither on this nor on any subsequent election to a vacant Bishopric, did anything, even approaching to this, occur. If there were any who watched the first election of a Bishop of the Irish Church by popular vote, with the sinister hope that the proceedings would have been of such a character as to cast discredit upon us, they were happily disappointed; for a calm, dignified spirit, befitting the occasion, pervaded the assembly, and the result was hailed with rejoicing by the whole Church. "We believe the Churchmen of the United Diocese," said the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, "are ready to receive the Right Rev. Dr. Day with loyal and cordial affection, and are all prepared, cheerfully and without any reservation, to welcome him to his Palace and new home among them. They will find in their future Bishop a Christian gentleman, a devoted servant of the Church, a gentle and affectionate ruler,

and one ever ready to communicate with his brethren in every good word and work. It is in contemplation to present the new Bishop with a congratulatory address from the clergy of Ireland on his being raised to the Episcopate, and we have no doubt that the names attached to that document will attest, both by their number and the position which many of the subscribers occupy, the universal esteem and respect in which the Right Rev. Dr. Maurice Day, Bishop of Cashel, is held by the whole Church of Ireland."

Gradually the Church began to accommodate herself to her new position. Not for one moment were her services interrupted in town or country; and not only were the ordinary services carried on as they had been for very many years, but everywhere additional services were introduced. The seasons of Advent and Lent began to be observed as they had never been observed before; and Harvest Thanksgiving Services, coupled sometimes with offerings for missionary work among the heathen, were held in parishes where they had never before been even dreamed of. So far from being crushed out of existence, the Church of Ireland seemed to have taken a new lease of her life from the day that an Act of the British Parliament pronounced her to be disestablished and disendowed. Her renewed vitality has gone on from year to year increasing in strength; and as the upholder of Scriptural principles, and the witness-bearer for Christ in this land, she was never more faithful and more energetic than she has been

during the years that have elapsed since she was flung aside by secularist politicians as a dried and withered branch, and a useless cumberer of the ground. Englishmen who have had an opportunity of being present at her General Synod, or at any of her Diocesan Synods, and who had formed the opinion that an Irish Synod must, necessarily, bear a great resemblance to the once celebrated Donnybrook Fair, have been filled with astonishment at the scene which they have been privileged to witness. They have been compelled to acknowledge that the Synods of the Irish Church are composed of men who are both Christians and gentlemen; and a very large proportion of them, both lay and clerical, are men of the highest culture, and possessed of valuable information, which is, if required, placed unreservedly at the disposal of the assembly. If a question of finance arises, there are always able financiers present to clear up a difficulty. If the question be one of law, learned Judges and Barristers very soon cut all the Gordian knots, and arrive at a satisfactory solution. And when theological problems have to be solved, *cela va sans dire*, there are Bishops and other Divines present whose knowledge and whose eloquence cannot but challenge the admiration of any Church in Christendom. Differences of opinion, of course, there must be; but these differences produce no unpleasant result. The most extreme opinion always gets a respectful hearing and a courteous reply. The most antagonistic opinions seldom, if

ever, interfere with private friendships; and when the debate is over, those who have ranged themselves on opposite sides speculate in private and friendly conversation with one another in the lobby on the probable result of the impending division. Then the conclusion is accepted, as it ought to be by gentlemen, in a spirit of fairness and cordiality. There have been, no doubt, exceptions to this general rule, but they have been exceedingly rare—so rare that the outside world has stood by and looked on in unfeigned amazement.

It may here be remarked that at our Irish Synods men do not classify themselves under party designations. *High*, *Low*, and *Broad* are terms practically unknown to us. Members speak and vote just as their intellect and their conscience direct, without any reference whatever to party. And this is just as it should be. In the British Parliament almost every one attaches himself to a leader, and all the world knows that that "High Court" is largely composed of men who, whatever may be their own opinion on any given subject, feel bound to support the party to which they have attached themselves; and they vote accordingly. No such policy is ever adopted in the Synods of the Irish Church; and long may we be preserved from the violence of party spirit in an assembly in which men have to deal with questions affecting the reverence due to God, and the welfare, entrusted to them, of their fellow-Christians. An English friend of mine, after listening for about four

hours to the debates in the General Synod from the Strangers' Gallery, once remarked to me:—"If Ireland had a National Parliament composed of such men as these, she would be the wonder of the world."

In 1874 the See of Kilmore, Elphin, and Ardagh became vacant for the third time since the passing of the Irish Church Act. Bishop Leslie, as I have already said, lived only three months after he succeeded Bishop Verschoyle; and in less than four years, his successor, Bishop Carson, followed him.

The Right Rev. Thomas Carson, LL.D., died at Portrush, in the Co. Antrim, to which place he had gone in search of health, on July 7th, 1874. He was the eldest son of the Rev. Thomas Carson, Rector of Kilmahon and Clonmult in the Diocese of Cloyne, and brother of the Rev. Joseph Carson, D.D., Senior Fellow, Trinity College, Dublin. Bishop Carson graduated in 1826; and held successively the appointments of Vicar of Urney and Annageliffe, 1838; Rector of Cloon, and Vicar-General of Kilmore, 1854; and Dean of Kilmore, 1860. In 1870, on the death of Dr. Leslie, he was nominated, as I have already stated, to the Bishopric of Kilmore, and appointed by the Crown.

On the last day of September, 1874, the United Synods of Kilmore, Elphin, and Ardagh met in Cavan Church. The Lord Primate presided. Nothing could possibly have exceeded the solemnity, the fairness, and the deliberation with which the proceedings were conducted. There was no tinge

of bitterness, no display of rivalry. All seemed to be deeply impressed with the importance of the work confided to the Synods. When the votes were counted, it was found that the Archdeacon of Ardagh (Ven. Dr. Darley) stood first on the list, and next to him Canon Daunt. The votes were—Archdeacon Darley, 129 Lay, and 87 Clerical; and Canon Daunt, 69 Lay, and 29 Clerical. The Assessor (Right Hon. J. T. Ball, LL.D.) then stated that the Archdeacon had a clear majority of votes, but the law required that he should have a *majority of two-thirds of both orders* to make his election valid. He therefore declared it necessary that a third poll should be taken, members being informed that on this third occasion they were either to vote for the Archdeacon, or to refrain from voting altogether. The result was that the Archdeacon obtained 163 Clerical, and 108 Lay votes, which, being considerably over the two-thirds of each order, the Primate announced that the Archdeacon had been duly elected to the vacant Bishopric.

Bishop Darley entered Trinity College as far back as the year 1816, and during his undergraduate course he obtained a Classical Scholarship, besides several First Science, Classical, Divinity, and Hebrew Prizes. In 1821 he took his B.A. degree. Three years afterwards he competed for a Fellowship, and was third on the list of candidates. The year following, undaunted by his former failure, he again sat for a Fellowship. There were eleven candidates and one vacancy. The Fellowship was

gained by Mr.—afterwards Judge—Longfield ; and Mr. Darley obtained the Madden Prize. In 1826 he was ordained for the Diocese of Armagh, and appointed Head Master of Dundalk Endowed School. In 1827 he took his M.A. degree, and in 1831 was appointed Head Master of the Royal School, Dungannon. This post he filled for nineteen years, during which time he educated a very large number of pupils, many of whom now speak of him in the most affectionate terms, and recall to mind with great pleasure their school-boy days at Dungannon. In 1850 he obtained, for the first time, clerical preferment by having the Rectory of Cootehill conferred upon him. Sixteen years later he was appointed Rector of Templemichael (Longford) and Archdeacon of Ardagh ; and finally, as we have seen, Bishop of Kilmore. At the time of his election to the Episcopate, he was seventy-five years of age ; but since the days of Bedel, the Diocese of Kilmore has not had a Bishop more active, more painstaking, more zealous, and more popular among clergy and laity alike than Bishop Darley.

In a charge delivered to his clergy in the month of October this year (1874), the late Dr. Butcher, Lord Bishop of Meath, pleaded earnestly for an educated body of clergy. Himself an ex-Fellow of Trinity College, and a man of very superior attainments, he felt deeply the importance of not lowering the educational standard of the ministry. His words deserve to be placed permanently on record, and to

be carefully remembered, that they may serve as a guide to us in the future. The Bishop said:—"Without an adequate supply of properly educated clergy, it is impossible that the Church can long exist in a state of healthy vigour and efficiency, however great may be the exertions of her lay members to provide for her material wants. I mean by *properly educated* clergy, not merely men who have gone through a certain course of purely professional teaching and training, but men whose special preparation for their spiritual calling has been preceded by a liberal education in Arts, and whose minds have been previously enlarged and disciplined by the secular studies of a University curriculum. This is the kind of education and training which our clergy have hitherto enjoyed in their preparation for the ministry; and it would, I am sure, be a disastrous thing for the Church if this broad and humanizing system were abandoned, and the studies of our future clergy confined within the limits of an exclusively professional course. We see around us in the clergy of another Church an instructive exemplification of the working of such a system as this. And although it may be in some respects adapted to the clergy of the Church of Rome, there can be little doubt that if it became general in a Reformed Church like ours, where the influence of the clergy does not depend on the exercise of supposed sacerdotal functions, but on the character and qualifications of the *men*, combined with the importance and dignity of their *office*, it

would give rise to serious evil. The truth is, that a really sound theological education cannot be imparted without a substratum of general culture."

This year (1874) was rendered memorable by the publication of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on *The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance;* and as the subject is closely connected with that of Disestablishment, and therefore with the Church of Ireland, I refer to it here. The pamphlet was written for the purpose of explaining and defending the statements made in an article which had been contributed by Mr. Gladstone to the *Contemporary Review:—*

"I was speaking," said Mr. Gladstone with reference to the article in the *Review,* "of the question whether a handful of the clergy are or are not engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanise the Church and people of England. At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth; when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."

Mr. Gladstone maintains and proves that these propositions are literally and strictly true. Every convert to Romanism must (1) "renounce his moral and mental freedom;" and (2) must "place his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another;" that other being, of course, the Pope or his representative. He also charges Rome with having "equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history." On a strict re-examination of this language, Mr. Gladstone finds it faulty, "inasmuch as it seems to imply that a convert now joining the Papal Church not only gives up certain rights and duties of freedom, but surrenders them by a conscious and deliberate act. What I have less accurately said," he explains, "that he renounced, I might have more accurately said that he forfeited."

It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Gladstone, with his brilliant intellect, that this makes the matter much worse, because the convert might refuse to renounce a privilege, but he could not avoid forfeiting it, if that were one of the conditions of his admission into the Church of Rome. The privilege, in fact, was taken from him against his will.

Mr. Gladstone argues the case against Rome very ably, and then with strange inconsistency he says:— "Although I had used expressions sufficiently indicative as to the tendency of things in the great Latin Communion, yet I had for very many years felt it to be the first and paramount duty of the British Legislature, whatever Rome might say or do, *to give to*

*Ireland all that justice could demand in regard to matters of conscience and civil equality*, and thus to set herself right in the opinion of the civilized world. So far from seeing, what some believed they saw, a spirit of unworthy compliance in such a course, it appeared to me the only one which suited either the dignity or the duty of my country."

Divested of all ambiguity, this plainly means: Rome, it is true, tramples upon the intellect and the rights of conscience; she has of late years refurbished her rusty tools for the purpose of carrying out her persecuting edicts; she repudiates modern thought, and she equally repudiates ancient history: but it is only fair and just that she should be permitted to have full sway in Ireland; and, therefore, the National Church, which has hitherto proved to be the most powerful barrier against Rome, must be severed from the State, robbed of her revenues, and, if possible, annihilated.

There were more than twenty replies to this extraordinary pamphlet written by eminent Roman Catholic ecclesiastics and laymen; whereupon Mr. Gladstone wrote and published in 1875 *Vaticanism: an Answer to Replies and Reproofs.* In this publication he reiterates his assertions, and as he draws his observations to a conclusion, he says:—"Attached to my own religious communion, the Church of my birth and country, I have never loved it with a merely sectional or insular attachment, but have thankfully regarded it as that portion of the great redeemed

Christian family in which my lot had been cast—not by, but for me. In every other portion of that family, *whatever its name, whatever its extent, whatever its perfections, or whatever its imperfections, I have sought to feel a kindly interest*, varying in its degree according to the likeness it seemed to bear to the heavenly pattern, and according to the capacity it seemed to possess to minister to the health and welfare of the whole."

The Church of Ireland was united to the Church of England before the Irish Church Act passed, and she is still united to her in the bonds of doctrine and affection; she was then, and she is still, a portion of the great redeemed Christian family in which Mr. Gladstone has "sought to feel a kindly interest." His kindly interest in the Church of Ireland came to a climax, it seems, in 1869, and so he disestablished and disendowed her.

Once more the Church was called upon to mourn the loss of an eminent prelate. Just as the year 1874 was drawing to a close, the Right Rev. James Thomas O'Brien, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, died in London. He had attained the ripe age of eighty-two, and had held the episcopal office thirty-two years. Dr. O'Brien was the eldest son of Michael Burke O'Brien, a native of the County Clare, and a Roman Catholic, who settled at New Ross in the County Wexford, and shortly after became a member of the Church of Ireland. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where his undergraduate career was

very distinguished. He obtained a scholarship in 1813, took his B.A. degree, and won a Gold Medal in 1815, and five years after became a Fellow. In 1830 he took his D.D. degree, and in 1833 was appointed Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity. The College living of Clondehorky, Diocese of Raphoe, situated in a remote part of Donegal, becoming vacant, Dr. O'Brien was selected for it in 1836. This parish being in a portion of Ireland which was then almost beyond the reach of civilization, was not much to Dr. O'Brien's taste, and, accordingly, after holding it for a year, he resigned it for the pleasanter parish of Arboe, in the Diocese of Armagh. In 1841 he was promoted to the Deanery of Cork, and the following year he was selected by the late Sir Robert Peel for the Bishopric of Ossory, which he held till his death. His fame as a theological writer rests chiefly on his ten sermons in defence of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, and on his Charges, which were always read far beyond the limits of his own Diocese, or even of Ireland. In some of these charges he dealt most ably with Romanism and Tractarianism; in others, he defended, with great power, the principles of the Church Education Society. Of that Society he was the chief mainstay and the brightest ornament for nearly forty years; and no one who has ever heard his speeches in defence of Scriptural Education could fail to admire the courage and the honesty with which he rebuked those who, yielding to the temper of the times, were afraid or ashamed to place

the Bible in the National Schools of Ireland. Dr. O'Brien's personal presence was calculated to inspire awe rather than love. His manner was cold; some would say, stern and severe; but Archdeacon Corvan, one of his own clergy, who knew him intimately, in a letter addressed to one of the daily papers shortly after his death, said:—"He had that cold exterior which so many College Tutors think it necessary to assume, and by this many were kept at a distance from him; but to such as quietly pressed through that slight fence he was as genial and as pleasant as any one could be." Of Bishop O'Brien's deep and earnest piety there can be no question; and his zeal in defence of Evangelical religion will long be remembered and admired. It has lately become the fashion with a certain class of people to sneer at the Evangelical clergy for their supposed want of learning; but even these sneerers could hardly deny that Bishop O'Brien, whilst eminent for his superior intellect, and for his great learning, was even more eminent for his deep attachment to those doctrines which are distinctively known as Evangelical, and for the clearness with which he taught and defended them. During the last few years of his life, his theological opinions underwent a slight, a *very slight*, change. The year before he died, he wrote and published a pamphlet entitled, *A Plea from the Bible, and the Bible alone, for the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.* Of this pamphlet it may be sufficient to say that whilst it is opposed to the views of many

who belong to what is known as the Evangelical section of the Church, it is accepted by moderate Evangelicals as an exponent of the doctrine of Baptism taught both in the Bible and in the Prayer Book.

On February 11th, 1875, the United Synods of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, met in the Cathedral of St. Canice, Kilkenny, to elect a successor to Bishop O'Brien. The result of the voting was that the Deans of Cashel and Cork, and Canon Daunt (Dublin), were found to have obtained a majority of votes. These names were, therefore, placed on a select list, and a second vote was taken. The Dean of Cashel then obtained a decided majority over the other two clergymen; but the majority did not amount to two-thirds of both orders, as required by the Statute. On a third vote being taken, the Dean of Cashel was found to have obtained a majority of votes, but not a majority of both orders. The assessor (Dr. Battersby, Q.C.) then stated that as the Dean had not yet obtained a majority of two-thirds of both orders then present and voting, it would be necessary to determine by another vote whether the name of Canon Daunt or that of the Dean of Cork should be returned to the Bench of Bishops, along with that of the Dean of Cashel. Ultimately a decision was given in favour of the Dean of Cork. The names, therefore, of the Dean of Cork (Very Rev. Robert Gregg, D.D.), a son of the Right Rev. Dr. Gregg, then Bishop of Cork, and of the

Dean of Cashel (Very Rev. W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D.), were sent to the Bench of Bishops, with whom the final decision rested.

That decision was given on March 4th, 1875, in favour of the Dean of Cork. There were eight Bishops present, besides the Primate and the Archbishop of Dublin. The Primate presided. The Bishop of Cork was not present, the Dean being, as I have already said, his own son.

Dean Gregg had had a most distinguished career in Trinity College. He had been Curate of Glanmire in Cork, and subsequently Incumbent of Christ Church, Belfast. Returning to the Diocese of Cork, after his father's elevation to the Episcopate, he became Rector of Carrigrohanebeg and Chaplain to his father. In due time he was promoted to be Precentor of Cork Cathedral, and on the death of Dean Edwards, he was appointed to the Deanery of Cork. In that position his administration of the financial affairs of the Diocese was marked by sound wisdom and very great ability. He was, at the time of his election to the Diocese of Ossory, the youngest Bishop of the Irish Church, having been only eighteen years in the ministry; and a novel and interesting spectacle was witnessed in Ireland, father and son, both Bishops of the same Church, and both eminently worthy of the position which they filled.

It is an interesting fact, and may well be mentioned here, that Dean Gregg and Dean Walsh had the degrees of B.D. and D.D. conferred upon them

at the same time (1873) by the University of Dublin (the usual fees being remitted); and that in 1874 they were both selected by the Queen to preach at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. Bishop Gregg was consecrated in Kilkenny Cathedral, on March 30th, 1875. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Salmon, S.F.T.C.D., who took for his text Philippians iv. 13: "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me." The venerable Bishop of Cork had the inexpressible satisfaction of taking part in the Consecration of his son.

There is only one precedent of this kind, so far as I am aware, in the history of the Irish Church. It was mentioned at the time by a correspondent of one of the daily papers. He said:—"Essex Digby, brother of the first Lord Digby, was consecrated Bishop of Dromore in 1671. His son, Simon Digby, was consecrated Bishop of Limerick in 1673, and translated to Elphin in 1691. Essex Digby died in 1683; consequently the father and son sat on the same Episcopal Bench for *ten years*."

On the elevation of Dean Gregg to the Episcopate, Canon Daunt, to the delight and satisfaction of all good men in Ireland, was appointed Dean of Cork.

Dean Daunt was a man of remarkable personal appearance, and of extraordinary power as a preacher. His tall figure, his finely-shaped head, and his intensely benevolent expression, arrested attention at the first glance, and predisposed his congregation to listen attentively; whilst his natural

and simple eloquence, combined with great earnestness of manner, never failed to deepen the impression which the first sight of him invariably made. The influence which he obtained, and retained for years, as Incumbent of St. Matthias' Church, in Dublin, was marvellous; and that influence was always used for the encouragement of everything that was good. To his natural gifts as a preacher he added that without which his preaching would have produced no lasting effect, the power of a high Christian character. It is no flattery, but the simple truth, to say that he was loved as much as he was admired; and that he practised to the letter what he preached. His services, held in the Exhibition Palace for several months, when his Church was under repair, were attended by thousands; large numbers of whom were Roman Catholics. Even priests of the Church of Rome were known to attend those services. He never made the least attempt to work merely on the feelings of his audience. He addressed himself to the conscience of every one present, and stated in the plainest, and yet in the most forcible language, the grand truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. To say that there was no great depth or display of learning in his sermons, is to say what even his warmest friends will admit to be true. This, however, was not because he did not possess learning, but because his discourses were purposely so framed as to attract and win those who needed instruction in the very simplest elements of the

Christian Faith. He was really a scholar of no mean pretensions, and could make, and did make, good use of his scholarship when circumstances required him to do so. The prominent features in his sermons, however, were generally deep earnestness, and a simplicity of diction which made them intelligible to the masses; and yet his stated congregation at St. Matthias' was composed of the wealthiest, the most refined, and the most highly educated of the citizens of Dublin, who were apparently as much attracted by his preaching as the multitude who possess neither refinement nor learning. It will be long, very long, before we shall look on his like again.

Matters of very great importance were discussed at the meeting of the General Synod in the spring of 1876.

On the 2nd May the Bishop of Meath (Most Rev. Dr. Butcher), in the absence of the Archbishop of Dublin, laid before the House the Report of the Divinity School Committee. The Bishop said that the Committee had done their very best to put the case of the Divinity School clearly before Her Majesty's Government; and although their efforts to obtain the compensation for which they asked had not been crowned with success, it was not because their claim had not been put forward in the strongest possible manner. He added that *the Prime Minister* (Lord Beaconsfield) *had expressed himself as being warmly attached to the Irish Church,* and had declared his

desire personally to further their interest to the utmost of his power. The Bishop of Down and Connor took exception to the Report, on the ground that it cast a slur on the Queen's University, one of the colleges of which (Belfast) is in his own diocese. The Bishop of Ossory (Right Rev. Dr. Gregg) in reply pointed out that the remarks of the Bishop of Down were applicable not to the Report of the Committee, but to the letter addressed by the Board of Trinity College to the Irish Bishops. It may be necessary to explain here that this letter contained a summary of the rules in accordance with which students were to be allowed to join the Divinity School without passing through the usual curriculum in Arts; but these rules had reference only to students of Trinity College. The possibility of the students of the Queen's University claiming the same privilege, was not taken into consideration by the Board.

The next important subject which was discussed was Mr. Tipping's proposal to omit the word Priest from the Prayer Book, and to substitute for it the word Minister. The Rev. Canon Henry Jellett (now Archdeacon of Cloyne) very properly argued that the Synod had already placed in the forefront of the Prayer Book a statement, that where the word Priest was used, it meant Presbyter, and that nothing further was necessary. He carried the Synod with him, and no change was made.

The great debate of this session, however, arose on the Baptismal question. The Rev. Dr. Salmon

moved the adoption of a clause of the Preface, which was under the consideration of the House when it adjourned the previous year. It was to the effect that as controversies had long prevailed in the Church on the subject of Baptismal Grace, its nature and extent, no substantial alteration had been made in the services, that the liberty of interpretation hitherto allowed would be continued, and that the doctrine of the Church respecting Baptism is to be collected from the Formularies construed in connection with the Articles. Dr. Salmon's solution appeared to many to be the best attainable under existing circumstances. Some, however, did not concur in this opinion. Mr. Thomas Lefroy, Q.C., moved a lengthy amendment to be inserted as a note at the end of the Baptismal Service. An interesting debate followed. Ultimately, Mr. Lefroy withdrew his amendment in favour of a similar one which had been drawn up by Lord Plunket. This second amendment was carried by large majorities of both orders. It now forms one of the clauses of the Preface to the Prayer Book, as revised and published by the Authority of the General Synod. It runs thus:—"In the Formularies relating to Baptism we have made no substantial change, though some have desired to alter or omit certain expressions touching which diversities of opinion have prevailed among faithful members of our Church. At the same time, we desire fully to recognize the liberty of expounding these Formularies hitherto allowed by the general practice of the Church. And

as concerning those points whereupon such liberty has been allowed, we hereby further declare that no Minister of this Church is required to hold or teach any doctrine which has not been clearly determined by the Articles of Religion."

When this clause is analysed, it is found to consist of three distinct statements; and these were affirmed by a preponderating majority, both of clergymen and laymen, in the General Synod. 1. No substantial change has been made in the Baptismal Service, although some desired change. 2. The liberty of interpretation hitherto allowed is to be continued. 3. No one is required to hold or teach anything on the subject of Baptism which is not clearly affirmed in the Thirty-nine Articles. Lord Plunket's proposal differed from Dr. Salmon's in two points: first, in its reference to the celebrated Gorham judgment; and, secondly, in its making the Articles only—not the Articles and Formularies conjointly—the standard of orthodox belief on the subject of Baptism. The votes recorded on this occasion were—Clergy, ayes, 131; noes, 14. Laity, ayes, 146; noes, 5.

In this Sketch it is impossible to enter into minute details on the subject of Revision, and to report the debates at length. I can only say here that the changes which were made were so slight as to be hardly perceptible. They did not alter in any way the character of our venerable Prayer Book. No change was made that was not rendered necessary by

the altered circumstances of the Church; nor any which can tend to cut us off from communion with the Church of England, or with any other Church whose Constitution is both Episcopal and Protestant.*

* Canon Liddon has lately (1885) charged us with making "havoc" of the Prayer Book; but the learned Canon has, after all, found it impossible to substantiate his charge.

## CHAPTER X.

### PROGRESS.

IN the month of August, 1876, the Church of Ireland had to deplore the loss of another excellent and estimable Bishop, who was removed to his eternal rest under circumstances exceptionally painful—the Most Rev. Dr. Butcher, Bishop of Meath.

His funeral took place on August 3rd, at Ardbraccan, Co. Meath, where he resided. The Provost and some of the Fellows of Trinity College travelled down from Dublin on purpose to attend the funeral. Many of the gentry of Meath and Louth were also present. There was an unmistakable feeling of genuine sympathy visible in the demeanour not only of the personal friends of the deceased Prelate, but in that of the whole of the immense concourse, which included large numbers of the Roman Catholic peasantry. The service was read by the Rev. Dr. Bell, Rector of Kells, the Dean of Cork (Dean Daunt), Chaplain to the late Bishop, and the Rev. Garrett Nugent, now Archdeacon of Meath.

When the Dean of Cork had concluded the Lesson appointed for the occasion—the marvellously beautiful words addressed by St. Paul to the Corinthians

on Death and the Resurrection—the Ven. Dr. Reichel (then Archdeacon of Meath) spoke a few solemn sentences. He said that under ordinary circumstances he did not think it advisable to add anything to the Burial Service appointed by the Church. But this was an extraordinary occasion. "We have lost," he added, "our friend, our father in God, a title never more deserved than by the late Bishop. We have lost him by a blow, sudden, unexpected, appalling. To himself the manner of his death can make no difference; for he was as much struck down by the visitation of God—as little responsible for his own death—as if his life had been terminated by an attack of apoplexy, which might probably have otherwise supervened. The only difference it can make is to his family and friends. Their anguish is naturally, although not reasonably, increased by the way he was summoned hence; yet, it must be a consolation to them, and to the whole Church, which has been profoundly affected by his irreparable loss, that he recovered his reason through the relief which the very act by which he died brought with it, and departed with a smile of perfect peace to his great reward." The Archdeacon then proceeded to speak of the Bishop's public life, and of the universal esteem in which he was held; but, overcome by emotion, he was unable to proceed, and after a slight pause he brought his address abruptly to a close with the words—"*I can say no more.*"

The Most Rev. Samuel Butcher, D.D., was born

in 1811. He was the son of the late Vice-Admiral Butcher. His mother was the daughter of Mr. R. Herbert, of Cahirane, County Kerry. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where, in 1834, he took his B.A. degree after a most distinguished undergraduate course. Three years after, he competed successfully for a Fellowship, and was admitted to Holy Orders. For several years after, he devoted himself assiduously to his duties, as a Lecturer and Examiner, within the walls of Trinity. In 1847 he married the second daughter of Mr. John Leahy, of Killarney; and in 1850 he was appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical History, having previously proceeded to the degree of D.D. He resigned his Fellowship on his appointment to the Rectory of Ballymoney, Diocese of Cork. His connection with the University, however, did not cease, for in 1852 he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity, a post which he continued to hold until his promotion to the Bishopric of Meath. On the death of Bishop Singer, in 1866, the Duke of Abercorn, who was then Lord Lieutenant, selected Dr. Butcher to fill the Premier See of Ireland. All who were brought into contact with him as Bishop, were charmed by the gentleness and amiability of his disposition; but he was not wanting in firmness when circumstances required of him that he should be firm. His speeches in the General and Diocesan Synods were always calm and unimpassioned, and remarkable for logical arrangement and argumentative power. His Charges were of a similar

character. The last of them, delivered two years before his death, part of which I have quoted in a previous chapter, dealt in a most masterly manner with the arguments of Professor Tyndall and other advocates of Materialism. I have already said that he took an active part in the General Synod in the discussion on the subject of the Divinity School. He was the spokesman of the Deputation which waited on the Earl of Beaconsfield, when Prime Minister, for the purpose of explaining the views entertained in Ireland with regard to the duty which devolved on the Government in relation to the Divinity School. He was the ninetieth Bishop of Meath, reckoning from St. Finian, the first Bishop, in 520, and the twenty-eighth in the Protestant line since the Reformation.

On October 17th, 1876, the Diocesan Synod of Meath met for the purpose of electing a successor to Bishop Butcher. Five clergymen, who had received the largest number of votes, were placed on the Select List, the Right Hon. and Rev. Lord Plunket heading the list with 84 Lay, and 56 Clerical votes. The Lord Chancellor (Right Hon. Dr. Ball, Assessor) then said:—"The effect of this voting is, that as Lord Plunket has a majority of two-thirds of both orders, his name must be again submitted to the Synod; but, on this occasion, only his name will be submitted, and you will simply have to say whether you will return him as Bishop or not. If he obtains again two-thirds of both orders, he will be the Bishop.

If not, I shall have to submit a second name with a view to send two names to the Bench of Bishops. The effect of this vote depends not on the number who vote, because those who do not vote for Lord Plunket do not, in fact, vote at all. It depends on *the number present.* You will have now to say whether you will choose Lord Plunket as Bishop or not." The number of those present having been counted, it was found that there were 76 Clergymen and 116 Laymen in the Hall; and when the votes were announced, it was found that 74 Clerical votes had been recorded, and 96 Lay. These numbers being very considerably above the required two-thirds, the Primate rose and said:—"I declare Lord Plunket to be duly elected Bishop of Meath, and I shall transmit the result of this day's voting to the Bench of Bishops, as I am required to do by the Statutes, and then make arrangements for his Consecration." This announcement was received by the Synod with loud and prolonged applause.

Lord Plunket was consecrated on Sunday, December 10th, 1876, in Armagh Cathedral, by the Lord Primate, assisted by the Bishops of Down and Kilmore. A very eloquent sermon was preached on the occasion by the Ven. Dr. Reichel, then Archdeacon of Meath, now Bishop of Meath. The Archdeacon took as his text the words of Christ to His Apostle Peter, "Feed my sheep." He said that at the ordination of a Presbyter or Deacon the Prayer Book directed that the preacher should set forth the

duties and office of him who is to be ordained, the necessity of that Order in the Church of Christ, and also, how the people ought to esteem him in his office. No such direction, however, is given in the case of the Consecration of a Bishop. The Archdeacon therefore considered it advisable to speak of the origin, and also of the expediency, of Episcopal government; and he expressed a hope that what he said would tend to bring about a better understanding between members of the Church of Ireland and Presbyterians, and to unite them in the conflict which they both had to maintain with Romanism. Then, in a masterly and scholar-like manner, the preacher dealt with the passages in which Bishops are spoken of in the New Testament. He frankly admitted the word Bishop to be synonymous with Presbyter in the Apostolic Epistles; but he asserted that, setting aside mere names, the germs of Episcopal government are undoubtedly to be found in the New Testament. To Titus and Timothy, for instance, real Episcopal authority was entrusted, and that authority was plainly acknowledged by St. Paul. The Archdeacon then spoke of the government of the Asiatic Churches during the age which immediately succeeded that of the Apostles, and affirmed that it is difficult, after a careful examination of the question, to avoid coming to the conclusion that Episcopacy must have arisen in Asia either during the lifetime or soon after the death of St. John, and that it must have had his sanction and approval. Refer-

ring to the Presbyterian view of Church Government, the Archdeacon said that neither the formularies of the Scotch Kirk nor those of the Irish Presbyterian Church favoured the idea that Episcopacy is a corruption arising from the usurpation by one Presbyter of authority over his fellows. This opinion had been held and taught by individuals; but it had not been put forth in any of the standards of the Presbyterian Churches. The Archdeacon summed up a very able sermon by expressing his opinion that the office of Bishop is a natural and necessary development from that of Presbyter; and that the difference between the two offices is a difference rather of jurisdiction than of kind. This view, he remarked, held out some hope of union between kindred National Protestant Churches, since it exhibited them as approaching each much more nearly than at first sight they seemed to do; for even the Presbyterian Church, while asserting the absolute equality of all her ministers, conferred special authority on those who were raised to the position of Moderators, whether of a Presbytery, or of a Synod, or of a General Assembly. And then he added these weighty words:—"If we ask what kind of obedience is due to the Bishop in our Church, speaking for the clergy, on whose behalf alone I presume to speak, I can give no better answer than is given by every Priest and Deacon when he is ordained. He then declares that 'he will reverently obey his Ordinary and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over

him; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting himself to their godly judgments.' I will not argue," he continued, "against the mockery of understanding this to mean, 'I will obey my Bishop just so far as the law enables him to coerce me into obedience, and no farther.' It is plain that the meaning of this most solemn vow is this:—That as the Bishop is set over the Diocese, to rule and guide it in the last resort, so each Presbyter and Deacon under him promises to submit his judgment, in matters of mere judgment, to the judgment of his Bishop, when the latter makes that judgment known: that although in matters of simple right and wrong, where conscience admits of no doubt, the inalienable responsibility of each soul to God can never be resigned; yet in matters of opinion, and which admit of degrees of probability, the judgment and opinion of the individual is to defer to that of his Bishop, when once it is distinctly and authentically stated: in short, that the Diocese is not meant to be a mob, a scene of disorder and confusion, but a regularly ordered army, in which every one has his own part, and must carry it out in concord with the spirit that rules and animates the whole. And had this ordination vow been carried into practice, from what evils would it not have saved the Church? All those pretentious developments of ritualising extravagance on the one hand, all that careless and slovenly negligence on the other; all those dissensions within the Church about things

in themselves of no importance, would have been checked and stifled in their birth; and the Church would have gone forth on her most arduous mission with her real unity undisguised, 'terrible as an army with banners.'"

This sermon was carped at and criticized by many persons as soon as it appeared in print; but no one has yet ventured to show that it is either illogical or unscriptural.

In the month of August, 1877, Ireland was visited by one whose name will be held in everlasting remembrance, the late Most Rev. Dr. Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop was for a time the guest of Lord Plunket, at Ardbraccan See House. On the 24th August—St. Bartholomew's Day—he was present at the Annual Meeting of the Meath Protestant Orphan Society, which was held in the Court House at Kells. The occasion was one of great interest. There was a very large attendance of the clergy and gentry of the neighbourhood, and besides them a considerable number of the most respectable farmers, with their families, and other members of the Church resident in and around the Parish of Kells. Lord Plunket presided. On his right hand sat the Archbishop of Canterbury, and on his left the Marquis of Headfort. There were also present on the platform the Bishops of Killaloe and Kilmore, the Deans of Chester and Clonmacnoise, the Archdeacon of Meath, and a good many clergymen, of whom it was my privilege to be one. In

the body of the hall were Mrs. and the two Misses Tait, the Marchioness of Headfort, Lady Olive Guinness (Lady Ardilaun), Mrs. and Miss Howson, and the Hon. Miss Plunket. After prayer had been offered by the Rev. Dr. Bell, Rector of Kells, and the Report had been read by the Rev. F. Hopkins, Rector of Athboy, Lord Plunket delivered an address, in the course of which he took the opportunity of explaining to the meeting the action of the Archbishop of Canterbury with reference to the Irish Church Act, when it was under discussion in the House of Lords in 1869. "In common with many others," Lord Plunket said, "His Grace saw plainly that opposition to the Bill would have endangered the safety of the Constitution and the peace of the country, as well as the interests of the Church itself; and that consequently it was the duty of all who loved the Church of Ireland to use all their influence to lessen the severity of the blow, which could not be averted." This the Archbishop did; and in order to make this quite clear, Lord Plunket read the following extract from a speech delivered by His Grace in the House of Lords:—"I will say for myself and my Right Reverend brethren that we are sincerely attached to the Irish Church. We know the excellence of the ministers of our Church in Ireland. We know the difficulties they have to contend with, and we know that this blow injures them, and is very likely to injure us. We have the same cause at heart; and though it is said this Bill will

dissolve the union between the Church of England and the Church of Ireland, we feel that it is beyond the power of an Act of Parliament to produce that result. The union of the Churches is a union of one common faith and one common communion, which existed before the Act uniting Ireland with England existed, and which will survive after that the present Bill shall have passed. We do not, however, desire that this measure should pass as it stands. I am anxious that your Lordships, giving the measure a full and calm consideration, should set to work in order to alter it into a good measure if possible."

"Ever since the Archbishop spoke these words from his place in the House of Lords," Lord Plunket said, "he has not ceased to manifest his good-will towards the Irish Church. He has always recognized her right to act as an independent Church; and only a few months ago, at a public meeting held in Lambeth Palace, the Archbishop stated that, in his opinion, the course which the Irish Church had pursued was such as to deserve the confidence and the admiration of the other Churches of Christendom."

The Archbishop seconded the adoption of the Report, which was moved by the Marquis of Headfort; and in doing so he made a speech which was listened to by all present with the greatest attention. I can only give here a very brief abstract of what His Grace said.

After thanking Lord Plunket for giving him the

opportunity of being present at the meeting, the Archbishop said:—"I conceive that it is a good thing for the Church of which I am a member that we should show as intimate a connection as possible with all the sister Churches, which are united in the same faith and form of worship as ourselves; and especially I think it is good for us to remember our connection with this Protestant Church of Ireland, to which in time past we of the Church of England owe a great debt, which, I trust, we shall never forget, and which has sympathised with us in many difficulties in past times, and I am sure will be ready to sympathise with us in any difficulties which may lie before us in time to come." Referring to what Lord Plunket had stated about the reports circulated respecting the Archbishop in connection with the Irish Church Act, His Grace said:—"I cannot understand what the reason can be for such a misapprehension that some persons have supposed that I individually helped to pull down the old Established Church of Ireland. *If I had been accused of murder, I should not have been more astonished.* Of all the public measures that have been carried in my time none did I more deeply deplore than that which removed the Established Church of Ireland from the position which it occupied, and which we were all in hopes it would continue to occupy during our day. In my little way, I endeavoured to do what I could to mitigate the blow that was falling on the sister Church which we loved. However, it is of no use contra-

dicting any statements that are made except by our actions; and I hope that it may be my privilege so long as I live to be able to show by my actions how greatly I revere and honour this sister branch of the one Church to which we all belong."

The Archbishop then proceeded to speak of Orphan Institutions, and of the special value of Orphan Societies in Ireland; after which he referred to the ancient history of Kells, and also to the modern Reformation movement which had its origin in and around Kells some forty years ago. Then he referred to some of the great preachers and theologians who have shed lustre upon the Church of Ireland. Among those of bygone days he mentioned Jeremy Taylor, Archbishop Magee, Dean Graves, Bishop Berkeley, Percy of Dromore, who was one of his own predecessors in the Deanery of Carlisle, and Archbishop Whately; and among those still living, Bishop Magee of Peterborough, and Dean M'Neile of Liverpool. He concluded his most interesting and spirit-stirring address in these words:—"I think when the day comes for taking stock of the religious life that has been fostered in England, it will be found that to the Irish preachers, stirring our hearts in a way to which our cold Saxon blood is not accustomed, we owe a great deal of the quickening of our religious life in every part of England. I could mention many others; but all who know the religious life of England in past years are quite ready to acknowledge the debt which England owes to Ireland; and I feel con-

fident that in the difficulties which beset the Church of Christ in this Nineteenth Century—whether they be difficulties of the intellect, or difficulties from that exaggeration of the religious sympathies and the religious feelings of men directing them to unworthy objects—we shall receive help and assistance from those in Ireland who feel for all our difficulties, and who will show that if we have any sympathy with them in their trials, they are not less ready to have sympathy with us and to give us that assistance which they are so well able to bestow."

Speeches were also delivered on this occasion by the Bishops of Killaloe and Kilmore, the Dean of Chester, and the Archdeacon of Meath. The Rev. Dr. Bell, as Rector of the parish in which the meeting was held, eloquently expressed the pleasure which he felt at the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and stated an interesting historical fact. The Synod of Kells, he said, was held in 1152, twenty years before the English Conquest of Ireland. At that Synod Cardinal Papparo and four English Archbishops were present; but from that day to this, no public meeting held in Kells had ever been honoured by the presence of an English Archbishop, so that August 24th, 1877, would henceforward be a memorable day in the history of the town and parish. Dr. Bell, with great felicity, pointed out the striking contrast between these two events. Cardinal Papparo attended the Synod of Kells for the purpose of enslaving the Church of Ireland, and completely

subjugating her to the Church of England, which was then under the dominion of *Rome*. Archbishop Tait had come there to express his sympathy with the work of the Meath *Protestant* Orphan Society; and, whilst recognising the independence of the Irish Church, to seek by all the means in his power to cement more closely than ever the Union which already existed between her and the Church of England.

The Archbishop of Canterbury preached, by special invitation, on the subject of missionary work among the heathen, in Armagh Cathedral, six days later, on Thursday, 30th August.

I pass on to give another proof, in addition to those which I have already given, of the vitality of the Church of Ireland.

The two Dublin Cathedrals, St. Patrick's and Christ Church, had been for very many years utterly neglected for want of funds wherewith to put them into proper repair, and the ravages of Old Father Time were becoming every year more clearly visible. The late Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness, Bart., undertook to restore St. Patrick's, and, at an expense of about £150,000, he succeeded in completely renovating the venerable pile. St. Patrick's will long exist to remind the world of the princely generosity of an eminent citizen of Dublin, who, during his life, was always first and foremost in the promotion of every good work. Mr. Henry Roe, another equally eminent citizen, resolved that he would follow the good

example set by Sir B. L. Guinness, and accordingly, after first building a commodious Synod Hall, and presenting it to the Church, he made arrangements to restore Christ Church Cathedral, which stands in close proximity to the Synod Hall. The building of the Synod Hall, and the restoration of the Cathedral, cost Mr. Roe not less than £200,000. On Wednesday, 1st of May, 1878, the Cathedral was re-opened for Divine Service. At ten o'clock the doors of the Cathedral were thrown open, and before eleven an immense congregation filled every part of the building. Nearly *four hundred* clergymen, from every part of Ireland, assembled in the adjoining Synod Hall, vested in their surplices and hoods, and entering the Cathedral in procession, were conducted to seats provided for them in the choir and transepts. The service began with a processional anthem, which was sung by the members of the choir as they passed from the Chapter Room to the Chancel, followed by the officiating clergymen. Morning prayers were intoned by the Rev. S. Tomlinson and the Rev. A. Barnes. The first lesson was read by the Rev. Dr. Tisdall, Chancellor, and the second by the Rev. Dr. Monahan. After the third Collect, Boyce's beautiful anthem, "I have surely built thee an house to dwell in," was sung. The Archbishop of Dublin preached from Nehemiah iv. 2, "What do these feeble Jews?" The sermon was singularly appropriate to the occasion. After describing the circumstances under which the Jews returned from Babylon to rebuild

their city and their temple, the Archbishop dwelt in most felicitous language on the difficulties which beset the Church of Ireland during the days which immediately succeeded Disestablishment, and showed how, to the great surprise of the enemies of the Church, most of these difficulties had been met and overcome. Speaking of the use which might be made of a magnificent building like Christ Church, the Archbishop said that what had been done in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, during the last few years, showed to what excellent uses a Cathedral, even in this Nineteenth Century, might be put, and what a source and centre of spiritual life to large populations it might prove. In many an English city, he said, the huge courts of Cathedrals are thronged with multitudes. In Ireland we have not, he added, those multitudes to draw from that exist in England. "But," said His Grace, "if I may venture in my own name, and in the name of those who are appointed with me for the due maintenance of the service of this house, it shall be that we have it earnestly in our hearts that no fault of ours shall defeat and make vain the intention for which this glorious house exists, and has entered upon another youth."

A collection was then made in aid of the "Association for Distressed Protestants;" after which the Holy Communion was administered to some hundreds of communicants, including all the clergy present. Another service was held at four o'clock in the after-

noon, which was also attended by a large congregation. The Primate preached from Isaiah lxvi. 1, 2: "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest? For all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the Lord: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." On Thursday, Friday, and Saturday there were special Morning and Evening services in the Cathedral, at which very large numbers were present. The preachers at the morning services were the Bishop of Ossory, the Rev. Canon Henry Jellett, and the Archdeacon of Meath. There were no sermons at the evening services on any of the days except the first.

I have already said in the Preface to this book that every week, for nearly six years, I wrote as *Special Correspondent* of a Church of England weekly paper, a letter containing a summary of Irish Church News. The account given above of the re-opening of Christ Church Cathedral is quoted almost *verbatim* from one of my own letters. Imagine my surprise when, a week later, an Editorial comment appeared in the said paper, headed "Christ Church Cathedral," and beginning with these words:—"We have read with no small anxiety the account of the re-opening, after Restoration, of the above Cathedral.. *We greatly fear that the woman, drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,*

*has set her stamp here.*" I confess that I felt very indignant when I read this sentence, and the unbrotherly and un-Christian sentences which followed it, and very much ashamed of my connection with the paper. However, as the Editor invariably published my letters exactly as I wrote them, I did not at once resign a post which gave me an opportunity of placing before a portion of the people of England an accurate record of events occurring in the modern history of the Church of Ireland, but continued to write on until, about a year later, my work, as Special Correspondent, came to an end.

Let me here say a few words about the historical associations connected with Christ Church Cathedral. The Cathedral was founded about a hundred years before the Papal Supremacy was acknowledged and submitted to by the Irish Church. It, therefore, stands as a material protest against the modern pretensions of the Pope to be the chief ecclesiastical ruler of Ireland. Founded and endowed by the Danes, who were the deadly enemies of the native Irish and their ancient Church, the Cathedral has never had any associations connected with the history of the native Irish, and yet, has never been regarded with any special dislike by the Celtic population of this country. It was originally called the Church of the Holy Trinity, and it continued to be a Priory down to the year 1541 in the reign of Henry VIII., who granted it the *status* of a Cathedral for secular canons, giving it the position of the second Metro-

politan Church in Ireland, next after Armagh. Since then it has been known as Christ Church Cathedral. It was in this Cathedral that the Word of God was first heard *in a language intelligible to the people.* To it the people repaired in large numbers to hear the English Bible read aloud. In it the Latin Mass first gave way to the Book of Common Prayer, and it was in it that Archbishop Browne destroyed the statue of Christ which had been used to perform a pretended miracle by Romish Monks. The foremost claim, however, which this Cathedral possesses on Irish Churchmen is, that in this ancient and magnificent temple the worship of Almighty God ascended on high, and His Holy Word was preached, from a period so remote as to be lost in the dimness of antiquity. And now that the building has been restored to something of its ancient glory by the munificence of Mr. Roe, Protestant Churchmen cannot but be proud of it, as they resolve that in the future, as in the past, God's Word shall be faithfully preached within its walls, and the salvation procured by Christ proclaimed to all who enter within its precincts.

On May 20th, 1878, I wrote these words with deep regret—they were published four days later—"I am very sorry to be obliged to announce that the Bishop of Cork, the well-known eloquent 'John Gregg' is lying dangerously ill, and that his death is hourly expected by his sorrowing friends and relations. The Bishop is more than eighty years of age, and has been for some months in feeble health. Last

Sunday his strength began to ebb away fast; and the Dean of Cork called upon the congregation assembled in the Cathedral to join in prayer for the venerable Bishop. At the close of the service special prayer was offered up. The Bishop of Ossory is in constant attendance on his aged father. Bishop Gregg has, indeed, been an earnest worker for his Divine Lord and Master throughout an unusually long career; and he may confidently expect to hear soon the cheering words addressed to him, 'Well done, good and faithful servant: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'"

On Sunday, 26th May, the Bishop was taken to his eternal rest. Even after his appointment to the See of Cork, no one ever thought of speaking of him otherwise than as "John Gregg;" and every one who mentioned him did so in the most affectionate manner, and with a sincere admiration for his brilliant talents and his Christian character. No one who has ever heard him, as he poured forth the utterances of a full heart and a cultivated mind, either in his sermons or in his platform speeches, is likely ever to forget his earnestness, his impassioned elocution, his forcible appeals to the conscience, or his skill in dealing with the tenderest emotions of human nature. If he had been a barrister or a Member of Parliament, he would, undoubtedly, have had conferred on him the very highest honours which his Sovereign and his country had it in their power to bestow. He spent his long life, however, in the service of One who is

above all earthly monarchs, whose cause he ever strove to advance, and whose message of mercy to mankind he was never tired of proclaiming. For fifty-two years he filled a prominent place in the Church of Ireland as a faithful and zealous worker in the ministry. Born at Cappagh, in the County Clare, in 1798, the year of the great Rebellion, he received his early education in his native county, and then entered Trinity College, Dublin, where he obtained a Scholarship in 1822, and, three years later, took out his B.A. degree. In 1826 he was ordained, and soon after became Incumbent of St. Paul's, Portarlington. He was afterwards Vicar of Kilsallaghan, and, in 1835, he was invited to Dublin, where he was appointed to the Chaplaincy of the *Bethesda*, which was then, as it is now, one of the leading Evangelical Churches of the city. During the great storm of the 6th January, 1839, the Bethesda Church was burned to the ground. It was afterwards rebuilt; but a new Church—Trinity Church, Lower Gardiner Street—was erected expressly for Mr. Gregg, who attracted to it immense congregations, consisting, for the most part, of the educated and wealthy classes of Dublin. Trinity Church is the largest, but by no means the most architecturally beautiful, of the Churches of Dublin. Situated close to the Custom House, it looks more like a huge bonding store, or repository for grain. It is capable of accommodating upwards of 2000 persons comfortably; and many who read these lines will be able to

bear me out when I say that not unfrequently, during Mr. Gregg's ministry, there was not a vacant seat; the aisles were sometimes filled with persons who were content to stand throughout the service; and all who were present, whether sitting or standing, listened with breathless attention to Mr. Gregg's quiet exposition of Holy Scripture, or to his fierce, fiery, scathing denunciations of sin, or else to his loving words of invitation as he exhorted his hearers to come unto Christ and be saved. Among the constant attendants on his ministry were the more thoughtful and earnest Divinity Students of Trinity College. Many an Irish clergyman, at home and abroad, can trace back to some of the spirit-stirring sermons of Mr. Gregg the first kindling of the zeal which afterwards led him to labour diligently in the service of our Divine Master. Lord Carlisle, when, as Lord Morpeth, he held the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland, very often attended Trinity Church, and learned to revere and admire the great preacher. In 1857 Mr. Gregg was appointed Archdeacon of Kildare. In 1860 he proceeded to the degrees of M.A., B.D., and D.D.; and three years later, in 1863, Lord Carlisle, who then filled the office of Lord Lieutenant, recommended him in very strong terms to Lord Palmerston for the See of Cork, then vacant, and in the gift of the Crown. For fifteen years Bishop Gregg wisely and judiciously presided over the Diocese of Cork, and won the esteem and regard of all whose privilege it was to come into contact

with him. After his elevation to the Episcopate, he never ceased to take an interest in those among whom he had so long laboured in Dublin. He was a constant visitor to the Metropolis, taking an active part in the public meetings of religious and charitable Societies, and in the debates of the General Synod. Fortunate was the Society which, at the "April Meetings," could secure the advocacy of the Bishop of Cork, for when *his* name was announced, there was no fear whatever that the meeting would turn out a failure. The cause which he undertook to plead was sure to be supported, for few could go away without having their hearts touched, and without a firm resolve that they would redouble their exertions in behalf of the Society commended to them by the venerable Bishop. Especially was "John Gregg" full of fire, or else the tones of his voice full of deep pathos, when he spoke of the labours of the Irish Society among his Roman Catholic countrymen whom he deeply loved; and when he painted in glowing colours the woe, the misery, the destitution of poor Orphan children, and asked that they should be cared for, protected, and taught the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Irish Society and the Protestant Orphan Society never had a more eloquent, able, and enthusiastic advocate than the late excellent Bishop of Cork.

The remains of Bishop John Gregg were removed from his residence to St. Fin Barre's Cathedral on the 29th May. There was a very large gathering

of sorrowing friends, including about one hundred clergymen. The Dean of Cork read the Burial Service, and then delivered an address, taking as his text the words:—"Sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake that they should see his face no more." (Acts xx. 38.) "We, too," said Dean Daunt, "are taking leave of one, who, like that other glorious Bishop, whose spirit he breathed, and whose steps he loved to follow, had gone in and out among us preaching the Kingdom of God. The tongue, once eloquent beyond that of most men, is now silent and hushed; the eyes that used to flash with fire of holy zeal are now dim and sightless; the frame so strong that we hardly learned to think of him as an old man until the other day, so full of life and vigour was he, his eye not dim, nor his natural force abated, is now laid within the narrow resting-place, and we speeding it with sorrow on its way to-day, with emotion, with affection, with great honour—the honour due to him and to his memory—sorrow most of all that we shall see his face no more."

The procession was re-formed at the conclusion of the Dean's address, and the coffin containing the body of the deceased Bishop was conveyed by train to Dublin, accompanied by several members of his family and intimate friends. For that night it was deposited in Trinity Church, the scene of his ministrations during the best years of his manhood; and the following day it was conveyed to Mount Jerome Cemetery. In the Mortuary Chapel the Burial Ser-

vice was again read by the Dean of Cork, and the Rev. Canon Archdall, Rector of St. Luke's, Cork; after which the Bishop of Cashel spoke a few suitable words to the assembled mourners.

Strange: passing strange! "How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!"

In little more than one fortnight after, the death of the Dean of Cork was announced. "Achilles Daunt"—so every one familiarly and affectionately spoke of him, just as they did the late Bishop, by his Christian name and surname—was suddenly called away from his earthly labours. In the month of April he had been seized with severe illness whilst engaged in conversation with a friend at the University Club, Dublin. On his partial recovery he went to the South of England for a few weeks; and his health being somewhat restored, he returned to Cork, and resumed his pastoral work. Then came the Bishop's illness and death; and it is generally believed that the excitement and the exertion of the journey to Dublin on the occasion of the Bishop's funeral proved too much for the Dean's delicate frame.

On his return to Cork from Dublin, after preaching the Bishop's funeral sermon in St. Fin Barre's Cathedral, he went for rest and change of air, accompanied by his wife, to the Hydropathic Establishment, St. Anne's, Blarney. There he rapidly grew worse; and although the highest medical skill was exerted to save his valuable life, it did not please God that

his life should be prolonged, and he departed to be with Christ on Monday, June 17th, 1878. He, too, was interred in Mount Jerome Cemetery, Dublin; and Canon Wynne, his successor in the Incumbency of St. Matthias', Dublin, spoke, to those who stood around the Dean's grave, words well suited to the occasion. The service in which the assembled mourners were taking part, Canon Wynne spoke of as a service of thanksgiving; and the procession as a triumphant march, bearing to its last earthly resting-place the body of a brave and noble hero in the army of Christ. "But," he added, "although we know that we ought to be thanking God for the joy of our dear brother, we cannot help feeling that we are, after all, a company of mourners." He then spoke of the various classes of persons to whom the Dean's death had proved a sad calamity, and whose hearts that day were filled with genuine sorrow; after which he proceeded to enlarge upon and to account for the marvellous influence which Dean Daunt undoubtedly possessed over all those with whom he came into contact. "Where was the secret of his power and success?" Canon Wynne asked. "Not his talents, although they were great; not his genius, although there was a bright sparkle of it in all he said and did; not his knowledge or acquirements, although they were varied and considerable. Something deeper still. First, strong faith in the unseen realities; secondly, the power of an intensely loving heart." On these two marked features in the character of Dean Daunt,

Canon Wynne spoke from the fulness of his own heart, and his words found a ready response in the hearts of his numerous listeners. "Here," he said in conclusion, "were the two sources of our brother's power—*Faith* and *Love*. Here is the great lesson we have to learn to-day; the mighty force of these two agents." And then, ceasing to address his audience, but in their name and his own, lifting up his voice to Heaven, Canon Wynne offered up a prayer for help to lean more on Christ's love, and for strength to endure all things manfully for His sake; at the conclusion of which there arose from the lips of all the bystanders a hearty AMEN. I shall ever esteem it a privilege to have heard *that address;* and few, I venture to hope, who stood on that bright June morning within the Cemetery of Mount Jerome, and took part in that solemn service, will forget the lessons which both the service and the address were intended to teach.

The election of a Bishop to fill the vacant See of Cork was held on the 27th June; and the choice of the electors fell, as had been anticipated, on the late Bishop's son, the Right Rev. Dr. Gregg, Bishop of Ossory. This was the first time since the Church had been disestablished that a Bishop had been *translated*. It has been said, and I suppose the rule generally holds good, that everything suffers by a translation *except* a Bishop. At any rate in this case it was but natural that the Bishop of Ossory should be asked to fill the place left vacant by his lamented father.

The Bishop of Cashel presided at the election in the absence (on account of ill-health) of the Archbishop of Dublin; and the Right Hon. M. Longfield, LL.D., acted as assessor.

The number of clergymen who voted for Bishop Gregg was 109; and of laymen, 198. These numbers being considerably more than two-thirds of those present and voting, the Bishop of Ossory was declared to be Bishop-Elect of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross. On the 27th July he was enthroned as his father's successor in St. Fin Barre's Cathedral.

The question now arose: "Who is to be the next Bishop of Ossory?" Public opinion, both lay and clerical, pointed unmistakably to the Dean of Cashel (Very Rev. Dr. W. Pakenham Walsh). Three years before the Dean had been all but elected to succeed Bishop O'Brien. On that occasion he obtained 73 Clerical and 212 Lay votes. Three more Clerical votes would have secured his election as Bishop; but the number having fallen short by three, the name of the Dean of Cashel, together with that of the Dean of Cork, who was next on the list, came—as I have already stated—in due course before the Episcopal Bench, and the Bishops, in the exercise of the discretionary power vested in them by the "Constitution" of the Church, selected the Dean of Cork (Dr. Gregg) as the successor of Bishop O'Brien. Now, however, that he had been elected to the See of Cork, it was but natural that Dean Pakenham Walsh should be called to fill the place which he had left vacant.

Accordingly, the United Dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin met in St. Canice's Cathedral, Kilkenny, on the 30th August, 1878, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Dublin, and by a very large majority, both Lay and Clerical, elected Dean Walsh to the vacant Bishopric.

When the result of the election was known, it gave, as every one knew it would, universal satisfaction. It is very hard to write of men now living and moving among us; but I state nothing but the simple truth, when I say that among the clergy of the Irish Church there is not one more sincerely esteemed, more ardently admired, and by those who have the privilege of knowing him personally, more cordially beloved, than the present Bishop of Ossory. His reputation, however, extends far beyond the limits of Ireland. He is known and valued in England, too, by a large and ever-widening circle of warm-hearted friends.

Bishop Pakenham Walsh was born in 1820; and educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated B.A. in 1841; and M.A. in 1851. In 1873 (as I have said in a former chapter) the degrees of B.D. and D.D. were conferred on him *stip. cond.*, by the University of Dublin, in testimony of his ability, and the valuable services he had rendered to the Church of Ireland. During his undergraduate career he obtained the Vice-Chancellor's Prize for the best poem on the "Marriage of Queen Victoria," and the Theological Society's Gold Medal for Oratory. At

the examination for Archbishop King's Divinity Prize in 1841, when the first premium was awarded to the present Bishop of Peterborough, an additional prize was bestowed on Bishop Walsh, on the recommendation of Bishop O'Brien, who was then a Fellow of Trinity College. It is a curious coincidence that he should have lived to succeed Bishop O'Brien in the See of Ossory. Bishop Walsh also gained a testimonium for distinguished answering in Divinity, and a first prize in Biblical Greek. In 1843 he was ordained for the curacy of Avoca, or Ovoca, in the County Wicklow, the parish in which the Avon and the Avoca flowing together form the "Meeting of the Waters," immortalized by Moore, "the Irish Bard:"—

"There is not in the wide world a valley so sweet
As that vale in whose bosom the bright waters meet;
Oh! the last rays of feeling and life must depart,
Ere the bloom of that valley shall fade from my heart.

* * * * * * *

"Sweet vale of Ovoca! how calm could I rest
In thy bosom of shade, with the friends I love best,
Where the storms that we feel in this cold world should cease,
And our hearts, like thy waters, be mingled in peace."

In 1845 the Bishop removed to the neighbouring Curacy of Rathdrum, and six years later, quitting the romantic scenery of Wicklow, he became Secretary of the Irish Auxiliary of the Church Missionary Society. This made residence in Dublin imperative.

His labours as Deputation Secretary of the Church Missionary Society for two years, and afterwards as Honorary Secretary for twenty-five years, it is impossible to overrate. No man living has done what he has done to recommend and to promote the work of this great Society in Ireland. To him, more than to any one else, the Society owes the present flourishing condition of its "Hibernian District." In 1853 he became Assistant Chaplain of Sandford, the Chaplain being the Ven. Henry Irwin, Archdeacon of Emly. On the death of the Archdeacon in 1858, he succeeded to the Chaplaincy, and laboured indefatigably at his post for twenty years. In 1861 he was elected Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin, the subject of his Lectures being "Christian Missions." In 1869 he visited England, and spoke frequently at public meetings in defence of the Irish Church, then threatened with Disestablishment. His paper on "Poor Parishes," read at Lambeth Palace in May, 1874, attracted a good deal of attention. He served as Secretary of "Master Brooke's Committee;" and he has also been a Diocesan Nominator for the Diocese of Dublin, and a Member of the Diocesan Court. In 1872 he was appointed to a Canonry in Christ Church Cathedral, and in 1873 to the Deanery of Cashel. After such a useful and distinguished career as this, it was but fitting that he should be raised to the Episcopal Bench. The Bishop of Ossory is known far and wide as an author. His fugitive pieces and contributions to magazines

are very numerous; but he is the author of books which will live long, and be read by generations yet to come, notably, *The Moabite Stone*, of which 12,000 copies have been sold; and *Heroes of the Mission-Field*.

From what I have said in this and in the foregoing chapter, it is quite clear that the Church of Ireland has had in the past, and that she has at the present moment rulers, who, with the help of her Divine Lord, are both able and willing to lead her on to victory in the spiritual contest which she is bound to wage against the World, the Flesh, and the Devil.

## CHAPTER XI.

### MODERN HISTORY.

DR. WHITEHEAD, in his *Life of the Rev. John Wesley*, one of the most remarkable among the many remarkable men of the last century, says of him:—"His great object was to revive the obsolete doctrines and extinguished spirit of the Church of England, and they who are its friends cannot be his enemies. He appealed to the Homilies, the Articles, and the Scriptures as vouchers for his doctrine."

Wesley lived and died a clergyman of the Church of England, and always strongly deprecated anything like an approach to schism. Modern Wesleyan Methodists, with a few noteworthy exceptions, have disregarded his advice and his example; and have set up an ecclesiastical polity of their own, which, if not antagonistic to, is not altogether in harmony with, that of the Church of England.

On Sunday, 9th August, 1747, Wesley arrived in Ireland, for the first time, to inspect the "Society," which had already been established by some of his preachers. He returned to England shortly after, but revisited Ireland in February, 1748, and preached in many of the principal towns and villages. On the

2nd April, he was at Moate, "the pleasantest town," he says in his Journal, "I have yet seen in Ireland. Here I preached to a handful of people, and then hastened on to Athlone. At six, I preached from the window of an unfinished house opposite to the market-house, which would not have contained one-half of the congregation, on 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.' I scarce ever saw," he adds, "a better behaved or a more attentive congregation. Indeed, so civil a people as the Irish, in general, I never saw either in Europe or in America."

Irish Methodism dates its origin from this year, 1748. For a very long time, extending into the beginning of the present century, Methodists in Ireland formed one body, and were regarded as important allies of the Church of Ireland. Indeed, they were, to all intents and purposes, members of the Church who thought it desirable to hold, from time to time, special additional services, which could be conducted without a strict adherence to the rules by which the Church was bound. In 1816 divisions sprang up here as in England; and a marked difference was soon perceptible between the "Wesleyan" and the "Primitive or Church Methodists." It seems strange that the former should have adopted the name of the founder of their Society, whilst they abandoned one of the essential rules which he made for their guidance; but so it was. In time, matters came to a crisis. At the time of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, the general body of Methodists

in Ireland had already severed themselves from her communion. Some remained true to their allegiance; and it was considered advisable that the union between the Primitive Methodists and the Church should be still more closely cemented. Accordingly, in 1873 two Committees were appointed, one by the General Synod, and the other by the Primitive Methodist Conference, to consider the best mode of carrying out the project for closer union. These Committees met several times; but difficulties arose on both sides, and the negotiations were broken off. In the end, a good many of the Primitive Methodists joined the Wesleyans, and, of course, they no longer continued to occupy the position of members of the Church of Ireland. They are now, in fact, Dissenters, like their brethren in England. The few who persevered in their allegiance to the Church of their forefathers formed themselves into an Association, of which the Bishop of Kilmore (Dr. Darley) consented to be President, and the Rev. Dr. Hoops, Rector of Kiltubride, Vice-President. The object of the Association was declared to be—(1.) To send out home missionaries to preach the Gospel in connection with the Church of Ireland in conformity with her rules, and under the sanction of her Bishops and Presbyters. (2.) To supply Primitive Methodists with the services to which, *as Methodists*, they had long been accustomed; and thus, to keep them from wandering into other pastures in search of the religious observances which they value so much.

When in 1819 the Rev. Thomas Wetherell, a clergyman of the then Established Church, rallied round the old standard the Church-loving Methodists of Ireland, they had 12,000 members on their class books, and these were ministered to by thirty-four preachers. In 1873 the numbers were sadly diminished, and after the failure of the negotiations between the two Committees a further defection took place; so that the Society may be numbered now only by hundreds. A Conference, however, is held every year at some convenient centre, and of late steady progress has been made. The machinery, which has once more been set in motion, is made to move on the old lines laid down by Wesley. A Bishop or Presbyter of the Church of Ireland must, according to the rules adopted, be the President of the Society. Members of any Protestant Church may join the Society, but no agent, whether paid or honorary, is appointed who is not willing to subscribe himself "a member of the Church of Ireland, and a communicant of the said Church." All preachers who complete their probationary course before being admitted to the full privileges of Conference, must subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles. No preacher is allowed to administer the sacraments; and even a clergyman of the Church of Ireland is forbidden to exercise this part of his ministerial office within any chapel or other building belonging to the Society, without the written permission of the Bishop of the Diocese in which such building is

situated. Any clergyman who has sixty members of the Society in his Parish, and who conforms to the rules, may, if he wishes, become an *ex officio* member of the Conference. These are the leading features of the Society as it now exists. Readers of ecclesiastical history who are familiar with the earliest type of Methodism, will at once recognise the exact resemblance between John Wesley's original plan and that which the Church Methodist Society of Ireland now reproduces. The movement is one deeply interesting to all who are watching the progress of events in connection with the spread of true religion in Ireland. The Society, which has arisen, Phœnix-like, out of the ashes of its predecessor, is destined to have, I believe, a useful, if not a glorious, career in the future. Now that the late Primitives have completed their desertion of the Irish Church by uniting with the Wesleyans, there is every reason to hope that the new Association will go forwards, and carry on the work which they have abandoned, and will each year enlarge its borders. The Primitive Church Methodist Society is now a recognized working Society, in close and intimate connection with the Church of Ireland.

The month of August, 1878, will long be remembered in Ireland. During this month the British Association met in Dublin. It will not be expected of me that I should here report that portion of the proceedings of the Association which had reference to the world of science. That would be a task

entirely beyond my power. It would, at the same time, be wrong for me to omit from this Sketch all mention of the prominent part taken by distinguished Irish Churchmen in the business of the Association, and of the intensely interesting religious questions which they discussed.

First of all, let me say that the President, the late Mr. Spottiswoode, inaugurated the proceedings of the Association with a splendid address, delivered before a very large audience in the Exhibition Palace. He dwelt first on the purposes and prospects of the British Association, and secondly on the external aspects and tendencies of the science of Mathematics. In dealing with the second part of his subject, he did not attempt to deny that there are some facts which are quite inexplicable by the aid of science. He asserted in language of great elegance and beauty that "Mathematics can tell us nothing of the origin of matter, of its creation, or its annihilation. She deals only with it in a state of existence; but within that state its modes of existence may vary from our most elementary conception to our most complex experience. Mathematics can tell us nothing beyond the problems which she specifically undertakes. She will carry them to their limit, but there she stops, and upon *the great region beyond* she is imperturbably silent." These were words of wisdom; and the Provost of Trinity College—the late Rev. Dr. Lloyd—referring to them when seconding a vote of thanks to the distinguished President, said:—"I

wish to direct attention to one expression in the latter part of the President's address for which I feel most thankful. Deeply as he is imbued with the love of his own science, and strongly impressed with its great, and, I would say, almost inexhaustible power, he has distinctly laid down the limitations to which it is subject, and has pointed out to you that there are spheres beyond which Mathematics cannot reach, which belong to other feelings and other sympathies, to *man's moral nature.*"

On Sunday, 18th August, there were special services held in many of the Dublin churches. At Christ Church Cathedral there were very large congregations to hear the Bishop of Derry preach in the morning, and the Dean of Norwich (Dean Goulburn) in the evening. The Archdeacon of Meath (Ven. Dr. Reichel) preached both morning and evening at St. Patrick's; and the Dean of the Chapel Royal (Very Rev. Dr. Dickinson) preached in his own Chapel at Dublin Castle. The Bishop of Derry's sermon was a masterpiece of eloquence and of sound doctrine. He selected two texts, one from 2 Kings iv. 26, "It is well;" and the other from the Epistle to the Colossians (i. 5, 6), "The word of the truth of the Gospel, which is come unto you, as it is in all the world, and bringeth forth fruit." The Bishop addressed himself mainly to those who cling with all their hearts to the Christian Creed, and pointed out why they ought not to be ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, and why they believed that it was well with them as

Christians. "He did not hesitate to do this," he said, "even in the presence of many who were the leaders of modern thought." Archdeacon Reichel's sermons, too, were such as might have been expected from one so well known as a scholar, a theologian and a profound thinker. At Morning Service he took for his texts John xiv. 19, "Because I live, ye shall live also;" and 1 Cor. xv. 17, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain." From these passages of Scripture the preacher pointed out that the resurrection of the body is a fundamental doctrine of Christianity. At the afternoon service the Archdeacon preached from the words of the prophet Elijah addressed to the people of Israel (1 Kings xviii. 21), "How long halt ye between two opinions, or thoughts?" "A great religious crisis," he said, "took place nearly 3,000 years ago, which appeared to be repeating itself now. King Ahab was led by his Tyrian queen, Jezebel, to adopt the Tyrian idolatry —splendid, sensuous, and deifying the animal passions. Elijah the Tishbite appeared on the scene, and a miracle decided in his favour his contest with the priests of Baal. On that decision depended the survival of spiritual religion in the world, for Israel in those days was its last asylum." Something very similar to this seems to be taking place now; and it was for the purpose of showing what the real issues are that the Archdeacon, as he himself said, described what shape Baal is assuming in these enlightened days, and what the Atheistic and Pantheistic mate-

rialism that is rapidly becoming fashionable really means. "The question," said the preacher, "was not so much between revealed religion and unbelief, as between natural religion in the abstract, and a system which, by denying the possibility of any actual knowledge of the matter, relegated religion to the domain of the imagination—a system which, in fact, amounted to absolute negation of its reality. Never since man began to think," he added, "was there such a crisis as seemed now impending. Compared with this question, all questions between Churches are frivolous; nay, even the contest between Christianity and Deism seems antiquated. It is no longer Deism, but the blank face of Atheism, that now presents itself." The Archdeacon concluded by saying that "if, after a thorough examination of the subject, men come to the conclusion that Jehovah, not Baal, is God, then they ought to follow Him with all the energies of their being, and to serve Him, not with bated breath and whispering humbleness, but with dignity, and without fear or shame, in the world, in the great congregation, in the privacy of the inner chamber, and in the stillness of the secret heart." The sermon was listened to with breathless attention by an immense congregation.

Dean Dickinson preached in the Chapel Royal from the first verse in the Bible. The object of *his* sermon was to point out that the Bible is an authoritative revelation of such truths respecting the world we live in and the race to which we belong as we

never could have discovered for ourselves; and to show that Science and Revelation stand distinctly apart, although each throws light upon and assists the other.

The meeting of the British Association in Dublin proved in every respect a great success. Ireland, proverbial everywhere for warm-hearted hospitality, received the hundreds of visitors who crowded to her shores with unaffected pleasure, and parted from them with unfeigned regret.

I descend now from these sublime heights to the level of practical, prosaic *work*.

There is one fact connected with the history of the Church since her Disestablishment upon which too much stress cannot be laid. It is this—that in every diocese in Ireland great efforts have been made to restore old parish churches, and to make them decent and seemly, and fit for the worship of Almighty God. For this purpose voluntary contributions were required, and these contributions have been supplied liberally and ungrudgingly. Not only have cathedrals been rebuilt, but many churches in which the parochial clergy minister have been renovated internally and externally.

Let me here refer to what was done in the course of a few years in the diocese with which it is my privilege to be connected.

On Wednesday, September 25th, 1878, the parish church of Mullingar—All Saints—was re-opened, after having undergone a complete restoration.

There was a very large congregation present. Several clergymen of the diocese took part in the service: Rev. Francis Swift,* Vicar of Mullingar, now Dean of Clonmacnoise; Rev. Richard Dowse, Tyrrellspass; Rev. J. S. Joly, St. Mary's, Athlone; Rev. Colpoys Baker, Portnashangan; Rev. Garrett Nugent, Diocesan Registrar (now Archdeacon of Meath); and Rev. George Kirkpatrick, Castlepollard. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Meath, Most Rev. Lord Plunket. In the course of his sermon His Lordship remarked that the work of restoration was entered upon not only with a view to seemliness and beauty, but to preserve the church from actual ruin and decay. I may here explain, by way of parenthesis, that the repairs, which cost £2,000, included a new roof, the raising of the chancel walls, the replacing of the old square pews by open sittings, the tiling of the chancel, nave, and transepts, a new font, a handsome stone pulpit, and two brazen coronæ. The Bishop went on to say in his sermon that when not long before he had been asked to make a statement respecting the condition and prospects of the Irish Church before the Bishops assembled at the Lambeth Conference, it was with no small satisfaction that he referred to the fact, that within the last thirty or forty years half a million of money had been expended in Ireland on the work of Cathedral Restoration. And what has been done with respect to cathedrals, he said with thankfulness, has found its counterpart in the case of our parish

* Dean Swift (the second) has lately (1885) been appointed to succeed the Very Rev. Dr. Reichel, now Bishop of Meath.

churches. Speaking of his own diocese, he said it has been so at Kells, Trim, Moate, Castlepollard, Tullamore, Killucan, and now Mullingar. Before the end of that year, the Bishop added, he expected to be asked to take part in the re-opening of the parish church of Navan. This church restoration has not been limited to our larger towns. It has extended itself to the smaller churches of our country districts. The parish church of Mayne had not long before been restored, and great improvements were made at St. Mary's, Drogheda, at Ardbraccan, and at Galtrim. I may add to this list my own little church—Castletown (Vastina Parish). Lord Plunket estimated the cost of these restorations at £10,000; and if to this be added the cost of churches at that time undergoing restoration, and that of churches newly built, the estimate would not fall short of £20,000. This sum does not include gifts made for the purpose of endowment, for the purchase of glebes, or for the erection of parsonages; and above all, it is exclusive of the annual assessments contributed by members of the Church in every parish for the support of the ministry, and the payment of expenses connected with Divine Service. It is impossible to feel otherwise than thankful to God for this exhibition of zeal; and impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than this, that when the Church of Ireland was "cast down," she certainly was "not destroyed."

Some wiseacre gave utterance to this strange opinion some years ago, through the medium of the

Irish newspapers—he has taken good care to conceal his name—that "the restoration of churches is the restoration of Popery." Whatever other people may think, we Irish Churchmen really cannot see any connection between spiritual religion and crumbling cathedrals, or dilapidated parish churches. We may, perhaps, be thought very stupid and thick-headed for this; but so it is. Our services were never more simple, more hearty, more earnest, more devout, and more thoroughly Protestant than they are at this moment; whilst at the same time they are conducted much more than they used to be long ago, on what are called "Church lines." So far from endorsing the opinion, which I have quoted, about the connection between Church Restoration and Popery, we are compelled to believe, on comparing the past with the present, that where the building which has been solemnly dedicated to the worship of God is allowed to fall into decay, the spirit of true religion must be at a very low ebb.

It is a strange coincidence that at the *very time*, on the same day and hour, at which Lord Plunket was preaching the sermon referred to above, in Mullingar Church, the Bishop of Tuam was presiding at Ballina over the United Synods of Killala and Achonry. He, too, spoke of the work of Church Restoration which had been going on in his own United Diocese. "It was an extraordinary thing," the Bishop of Tuam said, "what a great deal more activity was now going on in Church

work, such as adorning, beautifying, and altering of churches, than under the old system. Formerly everything was left to the Ecclesiastical Commissoners; but now that these props no longer exist, the result of the principle of self-reliance is apparent everywhere. It was a great blessing," he added, "to think that everybody was alive and astir, and seeking to do his best both in material and spiritual work."

It is, I say, a remarkable coincidence that two Irish Bishops should have been saying exactly the same thing at the same time in two different dioceses possessing little or no resemblance, so far as external circumstances are concerned. In Meath a large amount of wealth is in the hands of members of the Church; whilst Tuam, Killala, and Achonry is one of the poorest of the United Dioceses of Ireland; and each of these has been liberal in proportion to its means.

Three weeks after the Bishop of Tuam had congratulated the Synodsmen of Killala and Achonry on their zeal and earnestness, he discharged the pleasant duty of re-opening Tuam Cathedral, after a complete restoration, which it had taken about sixteen years to accomplish. To the indefatigable energy and indomitable perseverance of the late Dean—the Very Rev. Charles Seymour—the work then completed was due. The Bishop of Cork, who preached on the occasion, spoke of the difficulties which had been so bravely surmounted in the rebuilding of the cathedral.

It was indeed very gratifying to all present to see that noble building, in the heart of a large Roman Catholic district, finished, and re-dedicated to the solemn worship of God. "I see much," the Bishop said, "that is new; much that is beautiful; much that has lately been erected; but I see also a grand old arch which connects the building with a period in the history of Ireland—a very remarkable period—many centuries ago. This may be taken as *an emblem of the present position of the Church of Ireland.* I think it is a blessed thing, as we stand on the old ground, to hear the pure Word of God preached, and to worship in the same words as our forefathers worshipped in. I pray that the blessing of God may rest on those who minister in this beautiful cathedral, erected, by great exertions, in faith and with much prayer; and I trust that it may be a centre of life, the home of truth, and the place whence the Word of God may go forth to every part of the diocese."

I come now to two subjects of supreme importance in connection with the modern history of the Church of Ireland.

The first has reference to the influence of the laity in our General and Diocesan Synods. Laymen, as a rule, are not capable of legislating on questions involving theological opinions, for this simple reason, that they know little or nothing about Theology. They may be pious Christians, exemplary in their lives, and anxious for the spiritual welfare of those among

whom their lot is cast; but this does not qualify them to frame Articles of Religion, or to draw up Formularies for the guidance of the Church, or to give accurate translations of passages in Holy Scripture the meaning of which is disputed. And yet, men who would never dream of opposing qualified physicians, or learned lawyers, when medical or legal questions are under discussion, have not hesitated to denounce some of our most able theologians as *unsound*, because the opinions of those theologians did not fall in with their own views. Naturally enough, the dogmatism of these laymen has always been proportioned to their ignorance of the subject with which they had to deal. In matters of finance, in matters of law, in matters affecting the practical work of the Church, the advice of laymen in our Church assemblies has been invaluable; but it would have been far better if some of them had not ventured to intrude into the domain of theology.

Lest it should be thought presumptuous in me to say what I have said above, let me quote the wise and weighty words of one of our wisest prelates, the present Lord Primate, spoken as President of our Third General Synod on April 10th, 1877. His Grace said:—"The very constitution of our Synod should make us doubtful of ourselves, and careful and deliberate in our decisions. We have adopted triennial Synods, universal suffrage, and vote by ballot (for our mode of giving our suffrages by means of voting papers, seen only by the scrutineers, amounts

to that); consequently, the great majority of our Synod reflects the popular views on religious subjects. Now, we know that the mass of our people are *not* trained theologians, have *not* studied the questions that come before the Synod, and act, at least, as much from impulse as from consideration. And we must keep in mind that we are legislating, not for these alone, but also for a large number of the most valued members, as well as chief supporters, of our Church, who do not entertain the popular notions on the vexed questions that come before us; men of liberal education and cultivated minds, whose sentiments on religion and the Church assimilate to those of Hooker, Bull, Barrow, Jackson, Jeremy Taylor, and the great master minds who have been the chief adornments of our Church. The knowledge of this fact should make us *cautious and deliberate in our actions*, keeping in mind the unspeakable importance of union among ourselves, the fatal effects that would ensue from any internal divisions, and how ruinous would be the policy of narrowing the bounds of our Church, and departing from the wise toleration it has ever extended to all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

The second subject which it seems necessary to allude to here has reference to the supply of *efficient* clergymen for our Church.

Here, too, I appeal to the Inaugural Address of the Lord Primate, from which I have quoted above. "The old system," His Grace said, "of having

Curates for several, often for many, years, under the supervision of the Incumbent, training in all the duties of the pastoral office, afforded an ample supply of experienced and well-instructed ministers to occupy our parishes whenever they became vacant. *But all this has passed away.* The cure of souls is now often of necessity entrusted to young men, badly instructed, of no experience, and not unfrequently elected by persons who practically know nothing about them.* Not having now the advantage of the after-training I refer to, the young men who present themselves for orders ought to be *better prepared* than they were formerly, to make up for this deficiency; and it behoves the Bishop to be doubly careful in observing the apostolic precept to lay hands suddenly on no man. But the fact is that the candidates for ordination now are, in general, far *worse prepared* than they formerly were, and many young men are now parochial ministers, whose theological knowledge would scarce have sufficed in former years to procure their admission into deacon's orders. If we intend to maintain our position in this country, there must be speedy attention paid to this deficiency, with a view to a remedy. This is an age impatient of ignorance and shrewd in detecting it. Now, there is but one way by which we can meet the requirements of our Church, and restore it to its legitimate useful-

* See Correspondence recently (1885) published in the columns of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, on "Boy-Rectors."

ness and influence. It is, we must remember, the Church of the most highly educated classes in this country, as well as the Church of a vast intelligent body, composed of our enterprising mercantile, our agricultural, and labouring classes. A clergyman, to hold together congregations so composed, must be possessed of such mental power as a competent and appropriate education alone can bestow. A fluent elocution is worthless, unless knowledge be the spring whence it flows. A faithful minister of the Gospel has not only to feed, but to defend his flock. Assaults upon our Church *were never likely to be so frequent as now,* for our very position, as a Disestablished Church, invites them. Our cause is a good one; but our legitimate defenders must understand its merits. Our citadel is impregnable; but our soldiers must learn how to use their arms. I hesitate not to aver that our Church, in polity and doctrine, is the truest representative of the Primitive Apostolic Church upon earth. But it will not suffice merely to *say* this. We must be able to *prove* it, or, at least, to give such substantial reasons for our statement as will justify our holding the proposition. But to enable our clergy to do this effectually, or indeed to discharge profitably any function of their sacred office, not only is sound general education necessary, but special study bearing on the whole area of theology."

At the present crisis it will be well to bear in mind and to act upon this expression of opinion.

Our clergy ought to be, if they wish to maintain the truth in these days of scepticism and unbelief, not only pious, zealous, and faithful, but also, to the utmost extent of their abilities and their opportunities, *learned.*

The enemies of the Church of Ireland are very numerous, and they never scruple to publish injurious statements respecting her, without stopping to inquire whether there be any truth in them.

For instance, only five years ago, Mr. Robert Mackenzie, in a book published by Nelson and Sons of Edinburgh, made the following remarks about the Irish Church.

"Mr. Gladstone expected," he said, "on the disendowment of the Church of Ireland, that seven millions sterling would become available for such uses as Parliament might determine. The Bill fought its way against fierce opposition in both Houses, and on July 26th received the Royal Assent. The disestablishment of the Irish Church freed Christianity from a scandal; and if the disendowment had given full effect to the intention of Parliament, it would have freed Ireland from a perennial source of irritation. But the Church was wiser in her generation than the world. However imperfectly furnished with the harmlessness of the dove, she proved herself on this occasion to be amply endowed with the wisdom of the serpent."

This is a specimen of the language used in some quarters about the Irish Church. Every one who

really knows anything about the matter, knows that what is said in the foregoing paragraph is utterly untrue, if the meaning of it be, that the existence of the Church, as an Establishment, was productive of injury to the country at large; or that the members of the Church, in their dealings with the State, acted deceitfully and dishonourably.

Further on we read:—"Mr. Gladstone provided that no new interests should be created after the Bill passed. But five months elapsed from the introduction of the Bill before it became law"—this is inaccurate; the interval was one year and five months—"and during that precious interval the Church lengthened her cords and strengthened her stakes. Her Bishops 'laid hands suddenly' on every youth who could be persuaded to accept Holy Orders. When the Bill was passed, the Curates of the Church had increased from 500 to fully 900, and the incomes of very many of her clergy had undergone a sudden and unprecedented augmentation."

This, again, is utterly untrue. At the time of the passing of the Act of 1869, in consequence of the agitation which had been going on for some time against the Church, the number of Stipendiary Curates had fallen considerably below the average; and all that the Bishops did was to bring the number up to the full complement required. This step, if not actually directed, was certainly allowed and encouraged by the Irish Church Act. Of course, to each Curate ordained a reasonable stipend was allotted,

and this stipend was paid out of the Church Funds which the Act placed at the disposal of the Temporalities Commissioners. There was surely nothing dishonest in this proceeding.

The greatest falsehood of all, however, was contained in the following paragraph:—"It resulted from these very questionable manipulations that the sum which the Church had to receive was little short of *thirteen millions*. After Maynooth and the Presbyterian Church were satisfied, the sum gained for the general good of Ireland was little over three millions. The Church stooped to the inevitable Disestablishment; but in accepting Disendowment, she contrived to discharge from it nearly all that was offensive to her. She carried off, to solace her widowhood, nearly the whole of the endowments which had made her union with the State attractive."

The Report of the Representative Church Body published in 1879 tells us that "the total amount received from the Commissioners was £7,576,194." Of this sum, £422,700 were refunded to the Commissioners for glebes purchased, leaving a balance of £7,153,494, being very little more than half the amount estimated by Mr. Mackenzie.

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, of March 13th, 1880, commenting on the three paragraphs which I have quoted above, very properly says:—"When a great national wrong has been undone, it is natural to look for a great national blessing as the result. In the eyes of Mr. Mackenzie, the Established

Church of Ireland was such a wrong; but what happy results, let us ask, have followed the Irish Church Act of 1869? In what respect is Ireland in particular, or the empire at large, the better for this Act of Spoliation? Has the party that carried the measure prospered? Has Mr. Gladstone prospered? Is the Ireland of to-day as peaceable, united, prosperous, and contented as the promoters of the Irish Church Act promised it would be, when once that Act was passed? We have been told that it would require time to develop the happy results; but more than ten years have elapsed, and what do we see? It is not too much to say that disaffection, misery, terrorism, and incipient famine are at the present moment stalking through the land. Mr. Gladstone's olive-branch of peace has been an apple of Sodom to this unhappy country."

Five years more have slipped away since these words first appeared in print, and the Irish millennium seems further away than ever. We have been during the last fifteen years chasing, and we are still chasing, the mirage of the desert. The social and political condition of Ireland is at this instant most deplorable. Tranquillity, security for life and property, obedience to the law, are still quite the exception, not the rule. The Church pursues her way triumphantly. The Church carries on her holy warfare against sin and error. The Church gains strength every year, and feels perfectly secure under the protection of her Divine Lord. The State is

agitated and convulsed, perplexed and irresolute; at one moment determined to uphold her authority, at another cowering ignobly beneath the taunts of a despicable political faction. This is the picture which Ireland presents to the student of history in 1885. How different from the picture which was drawn by statesmen of the Gladstone school when, in 1869, they passed their Spoliation Act!

I have already shown how the number of Archbishops and Bishops was reduced (in the year 1830) to twelve; and how it was proposed in 1868 to reduce them still further to eight. But about six years ago it was actually suggested that the Irish Church should increase the number of her prelates, and a plan was put forward by which, after the death of the present Primate, the Bishopric of Clogher (now united to Armagh) should be restored. The Primate has very clearly expressed himself as decidedly opposed to this measure; and it may be interesting to some of my readers to have this expression of opinion in His Grace's own words, spoken at the meeting of the General Synod in 1880. "It is a question," the Primate said, "in which I take a deep interest; but that interest has nothing in it of a personal nature, for when it comes on for settlement, I shall have bid farewell for ever to all things that are done under the sun. One of the chief features of the Church that it devolves upon you to preserve, to protect, and to uphold, is that *ancient patriarchate which has come down to us from that holy missionary*

*who first successfully planted the triumphant standard of the Cross upon the desolated altars of Paganism in this country.* I am the hundred and eighth prelate who has succeeded to his honours and occupied his Primatial Throne. I think that it would be a great misfortune to the Church if this link, which unites us with the past, were broken, and this time-honoured office were abandoned. But even this would be better than the fate with which it is threatened. The scheme to separate Clogher from Armagh, and to form them into two separate bishoprics, would, if carried into operation, have the effect of reducing the Primacy to such a state of poverty as would make it an object of contempt. In this world poverty has ever been despised, and never more so than when attached to high-sounding titles and exalted positions; and I know of no law by which the clergy are exempted from the common fate of mankind. I think that it must be apparent to every member of this Synod that we cannot retain the Primacy, with any advantage to the Church or any credit to ourselves, unless we provide the possessor of the title with a decent, though it must be a limited, competency." Then, after dealing with the financial aspect of the scheme, the Primate said:—"Having given a very full consideration to the question of separating these dioceses in all its bearings, I have arrived at the conviction that the union between Armagh and Clogher is the very last in Ireland that ought to be dissolved. First, for very weighty financial rea-

sons, which I may sum up thus. To endow Armagh will require £62,000; to endow Clogher with even £1,000 a-year will require £25,000 more; and to procure a residence for the Bishop, at least £5,000 additional. To raise such a sum off the United Diocese is, in my judgment, beyond the limits of probability. Secondly, such a division is called for by no necessity whatever. In area the United Diocese of Armagh and Clogher is less by 900,000 acres than the Diocese presided over by the Bishop of Tuam. In extent it ranks the fifth of the Irish Dioceses. It is easily travelled. Railways cross it from north to south, from east to west; and with few exceptions, every parish where confirmations need to be held can be reached by railway. It is very different with other Dioceses where the difficulties of travelling are very great. In fact, there is no United Diocese in Ireland of which the duties can be discharged with greater facility than in Clogher and Armagh. Is it not absurd, then, to provide two Bishops to discharge duties that can easily be performed by one, and this to the impoverishment, if not final destruction, of the most ancient and honoured Bishopric of all?"

Nothing more need now be said on the subject. It will be discussed in all its bearings at some future time in the Synods of our Church; but it is only right that the opinion of the venerable Primate should be placed permanently on record in a Sketch, such as this is, of Irish Church history.

In the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* of May 29th, 1880, I find the following admirable article; and as a complete confirmation of all that I have said in the foregoing pages, I quote it, in the hope that it may be read by many in England who entertain the opinions against which the *Gazette* so eloquently protests. The writer tells us that—"The *Standard*, speaking of the Church and politics, says, 'None were more anxious than they (the far-sighted leaders of the Conservative party) to be quit of the *damnosa hæreditas* of the Irish Church question; none more alarmed than they when the eloquence of the Bishop of Peterborough almost wrecked the Bill in the Upper House; none more relieved than they when the Cairns compromise set the matter at rest for ever.' Thus the rope was cut that bound our poor boat to the 'first-rate,' the Church of England. 'All that a man hath will he give for his life' were Satan's words. They are true, even though spoken by Satan. What says a writer in the last *Guardian*, signing himself 'D.C.L., Oxon,' of our Church, with an existence older than, and with a title to her property equal to, that of his? He has the effrontery to say, 'As to the Church of Ireland, does any Churchman now regret the Disestablishment?' Does this D.C.L. speak of mere loss of *prestige* and seats in the Lords? If so, who cares for it? It is perhaps more harm than good. He goes on—'Would any one re-establish such a Church, were it possible?' Such a Church! Was it a Church of God or not, that he

thus spits on it, and treads it in the mire? But let us hear this learned D.C.L., Oxon. 'Can a Church live which has no inherent vitality, which has failed in its mission, and is simply propped up by the rotten staff of the State Establishment?' What on earth does the writer mean? Vitality! Why, if our Church had not vitality, how could it have existed at all under England's treatment of it? Under Henry II. England bought the land by surrendering our Church's freedom to the Pope. At the Reformation we adopted England's changes. This alienated the people from us, because they writhed under her rule. England treated everything Irish, produce and manufactures alike, so as, if possible, to destroy their rivalry with her own. Ireland, therefore, treated our Reformed Church as a part of England's yoke. But how did England manage our Church? The refuse of her clergy were sent over to fill our Sees. The Irish-speaking people, who could not understand English, were allowed the privilege of hearing the service in *Latin*. Irish-speaking clergymen were passed over as disaffected. How could we keep or regain the people thus ruled and officered? No inherent vitality! If it had not had a Divine vitality, England would have destroyed it ages ago. 'Which has failed in its mission,' he says. How have we failed? Have we lost men like Newman and Manning, or statesmen like Lord Ripon? Lord Granard goes for nothing, and as to Lord Emly, his surroundings were all English. But let England con-

sider all her Dissenters before she twits us for not having snatched Irish-speaking rustics from Irish-speaking priests. What does D.C.L. mean by saying that we were simply propped up by the rotten staff of a State Establishment? What *is* a State Establishment? *Prestige* and priority over the sects —that and nothing else. Does he identify our income with State Establishment? If so, he must be ignorant indeed. Our property we had by gift of donors, whether the State smiled on us or frowned. But of this the State sacrilegiously robbed us, to please the Dissenters of England and the Papists of Ireland. The Irish Church, this kind gentleman says, is now on its trial. Very likely, with twenty or thirty poor farmers to pay a clergyman. The priests and Mr. Gladstone knew this. Our clergy were to be starved out, and their flocks drawn over to Rome, the Dissenters, Plymouth Brethren, or Infidelity. What cared Mr. Gladstone so long as he could buy the votes of the Priests and English Dissenters? D.C.L. says well, that we are on our trial, and he may glory in having put us on it. But he crows when he thinks of the security of his own Church. 'The Church of England,' he says, 'stands on her own ground. State policy never made and cannot unmake her. Her title to the property she holds is infinitely superior to the title to any property in the land; she holds her own by a better title than that by which the Queen holds her Crown.' Which is safer, *his Church* or *the Queen*, it is hard to say, in the

flood of which Mr. Gladstone and his followers have opened the sluices. We have read of a Russian on a sledge casting one of the party to the wolves in the hope of saving the rest. Thus has England cast one of God's Churches to its raging foes. D.C.L. hugs himself in his fancied security on his sledge; but the wolves are after him, their strength is increased, and their courage emboldened by feasting on that which the cowardice and treachery of Mr. Gladstone, and such as D.C.L., have thrown to them, by way of satisfying their insatiable hunger and fury. '*State policy never made and cannot unmake her. Her title to the property she holds is infinitely superior to the title of any property in the land. She holds her own by a better title than that by which the Queen holds her Crown.*' All this was OUR plea. It failed to charm Mr. Gladstone; and so we fear it will strike on deaf ears whenever murders or blowing up Clerkenwells bring the plunder of the English Church within what he calls the range of probable or possible politics."

It can no longer be said that our Church is "on her trial." She has come out of her fiery trial unscathed, uninjured. She has nobly vindicated her claim to be regarded as *the* Church of Ireland. Henceforward he will be bold, indeed, who will venture to dispute the justice of her claim.

The Church of the majority of the people of Ireland is the Church of *Rome* in Ireland, the head of which is an Italian ecclesiastic. The Church of

Rome in Ireland is, therefore, essentially a foreign church. The Presbyterian Church is the Church of *Scotland* in Ireland. Methodists, Baptists, Independents, Plymouth Brethren, and others are Dissenters from the doctrine and discipline of the Church. But the Church founded by St. Patrick has existed in this land, as I have shown, for fourteen centuries; she has survived innumerable vicissitudes; her continuity has never been broken; and she is now, as she has been throughout her long and eventful history, THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

Our Church exists as one compact body. Party spirit, as it has developed itself in England, and in some of our Colonial Churches, is practically unknown to us. *High*, *Low*, and *Broad* are to us, as I have already said, merely theological terms, not words which rally us round a banner to engage in battle. Differences of opinion on some subjects exist, of course; but we have somehow or another discovered the art of expressing our opinions without violating the rules of propriety, or breaking up the Church into sections. In England, the difference between the service as it is conducted in a Ritualistic church, and the service as it is conducted in an Evangelical church, is so immensely great that it seems impossible to believe that the officiating clergymen are really ministers belonging to the same religious communion, ordained by the same Bishops, and with the use of exactly the same form of words.

In Ireland you may attend Divine Service in Dublin, in Cork, in Belfast, in the Midland Counties, or in Connemara; and you will find *uniformity in* public worship, and a general agreement on all the leading truths of the Gospel as they are taught from the pulpit. This is one of the facts to which our Church owes so much of her inherent strength.

At the Church Conference, which is held every year in Dublin during the month of April, one may hear addresses on subjects of deep interest, delivered by learned Bishops and Presbyters, and by learned Laymen, too; addresses which are not in the slightest degree tinged with the spirit of party, although each speaker is perfectly free to move along any line which he selects for himself. And this, which is true of the Church Conference, is also true of the many religious meetings which are held during the same month of each year. Englishmen, who have been present at these meetings, have been very much struck with the exhibition of brotherly union and concord which forms one of their most prominent features.

In a paper which the Rev. Canon Peacocke, D.D., read before the Clerical Society, at its annual meeting, held in Dublin, November 19th, 1879, he said:—"The differences of opinion that divide Irish Churchmen from one another are far less than those which separate Church parties in England. The events of the past ten years have amply established this fact,

and we have reason to be deeply thankful for it." And then, whilst counselling his brethren in the ministry to continue to stand together, and to act together, Canon Peacocke added:—"Disunion has long been the reproach and the weakness of the Reformed Anglican Church and its branches, just as politically it has been the curse of our own unfortunate country. We of the Church of Ireland are just now in a favourable position for setting to other churches an example of union among ourselves, and what good it can accomplish—not a union in which all honest differences of opinion are sunk, but a union founded on mutual respect and esteem, and on the heartfelt desire to remove, as far as we can, any hindrance that lies in the way of the progress of true religion through the agency of our Church. In this land of political disunion and strife it would be a humiliating confession to have to make that that Church which claims for herself the proud title of 'The Church of Ireland,' instead of presenting to the world an example of unity, is the only organized religious body that is not at unity with itself, and that whatever deeper grounds she may have for claiming this title, there is at least THIS fitness in her appropriating it to herself—that she is the *disunited* Church of a *disunited* country."

This excellent advice has been, as I have shown above, fully acted upon, and we may with pardonable

pride now apply to our Church the words in which David, in the 122nd Psalm (Revised Version), describes the city over which he ruled:—

> "Jerusalem that art builded
> As a city that is compact together;
> Whither the tribes go up, even the tribes of the Lord,
> For a testimony unto Israel,
> To give thanks unto the name of the Lord."

## CHAPTER XII.

### CHURCH WORK.

I SHALL endeavour in this, my concluding chapter, to give the reader some account of the practical work done by the Church of Ireland; and to forecast her possible future. I hope to be able to show that, not only does she possess a large amount of vitality, but that all her powers are exerted in the service of her Divine Lord, Jesus Christ; and that her earnest desire is, that all who come under her influence may be "led into the way of truth," and may "hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

And, first, let me say that the Irish Church is the only religious body in Ireland which recites the Ten Commandments regularly in public worship. Other religious bodies, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, include in their teaching, from time to time, obedience to these Commandments; but the Church of Ireland, Sunday after Sunday, solemnly repeats them in her Morning Service, and requires the people to pray God "to incline their hearts" to keep each law as it is read out in their hearing. Those who believe that public morality is founded on obedience

to the moral law will not fail to realise the immense importance which must attach to such public teaching as this.

In the next place, the Church of Ireland is the only religious body in this country in which the Bible is regularly and systematically read to every congregation of worshippers. To Roman Catholics, the Bible is a sealed book. Here and there a Fénélon (an Archbishop) or a Pascal (a layman) may be found who has obtained some knowledge of its contents; but in reading it, he is forbidden to exercise in any degree his private judgment as to its meaning. To the great mass of the people it is as absolutely unknown as the Koran, or the Precepts of Confucius. Protestant Dissenters, no doubt, read the Bible publicly, and profess to base all their teaching upon it; but they do not read it through. A chapter here, and a chapter there, according to the pleasure, or it may be the caprice, of the minister, is read in the ears of the people; and thus, so far as public worship is concerned, all that can be had is an occasional sip of the water of life. In the Church of Ireland that water is kept perpetually flowing from the fountain, to refresh the souls of men. Wherever, as in our cathedrals, daily service is held, the Bible is read according to a previously arranged system; and even in parish churches, where services are less frequent, the whole system of Christian Doctrine is brought each year before the notice of the people by means of the "Lessons" taken from Holy Scripture; so that

ignorance is impossible, if only the hearer listen attentively to what is read. I am aware, of course, that these remarks apply equally to the Church of England; but the social and political condition of Ireland give increased significance to the fact that, day after day, and week after week, the National Church proclaims, in her public assemblies, "the whole counsel of God," and thus enters her protest against lawlessness as well as against false doctrine. In the midst of surrounding darkness she holds aloft the torch of Truth. Her hands never fail to grasp it; her arms never tire as she steadily keeps them raised on high, that all may see the way that leadeth unto life.

Such a Church as this may naturally be expected to show the world her faith by her works; and so she does.

I speak not now of the internal ministerial work done by the Church, although that is above all praise. Faithfully and efficiently her Bishops and her clergy, in town and country, in populous parishes and in thinly-peopled districts, where her children are few in number, and scattered over wide areas like sheep in a wilderness, labour incessantly to keep alive that spirit of true religion without which there can be neither national prosperity nor individual communion with God through Jesus Christ. I speak rather of the efforts of the Church in her corporate capacity to relieve human misery, to instruct in the truths of the Gospel those of our Roman Catholic brethren who

are ignorant, as we believe, of what true Christianity really is, and, also to make known the same truths to Heathens, Mohammedans, and others, who, in countries distant from us, are altogether beyond the range of Christian influences.

Looking at the Church of Ireland from this standpoint, we find that she has made and is making noble efforts, which prove her to be in every way worthy of the position which she has occupied ever since the days of St. Patrick.

Let us see what she is doing for the destitute children of her own Communion.

In every part of Ireland poor members of the Church, artisans, farmers, labourers, domestic servants, and others, of a similar social condition, die, leaving behind them children for whom it has been impossible to make any provision. This, one need hardly say, is a calamity not peculiar to any age or country; certainly, not peculiar to Ireland. But there are circumstances arising from the anomalous position of Ireland which render it absolutely necessary that cases of this kind should be dealt with in a manner altogether exceptional. When the head of the family has been taken away by the stroke of death, the unprotected wife and children are liable to be assailed by temptations which it is very hard to resist. There are convents open to receive the girls, there are situations offered for acceptance to the boys, if only they will abandon their Protestant principles, and openly avow themselves "Catholics." Here the

Church of Ireland comes to the rescue. The "Protestant Orphan Society" at once takes charge of these waifs and strays, provided the parents have been respectable and industrious; feeds, clothes, educates the orphans, watches over them with all a mother's care and a father's anxiety for years, and, finally, gives them a start in life which rarely fails to make of them useful citizens and well-conducted members of the Church. In the year 1828, after the interment of an esteemed Protestant artisan in the City of Dublin, three of the friends of the deceased, whilst engaged in earnest conversation as to the best means of providing for the Orphan children whom he had left behind, resolved that a Society should be formed which should deal with all similar cases; and so, in due time, the Protestant Orphan Society was founded, and it is no exaggeration to say that it has done a work the magnitude and the importance of which can never be fully estimated. It still exists, it still flourishes, it still comes to the relief of those who, but for its assistance, would be abandoned to the ways of vice, or tempted to fall away from the principles which the Church of Ireland instils into all her members. The Society has, since its formation, had under its care 2,730 Orphans. At the close of the year 1884 there were 228 to be protected, supported, and educated.

It was impossible, however, for one central Society, having its head-quarters in Dublin, to deal satisfactorily with the case of orphans who lived in compara-

tively remote country parishes. The result has been that County Societies, managed by local committees, and supported by the resident gentry and other Church members of the county, have sprung up in all directions. Almost every county in Ireland now has its Protestant Orphan Society; and it is quite impossible that any case of real destitution can be overlooked or neglected. Is not this practical work of immense importance? It certainly is; for "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction."

Then we have the *Church of Ireland Society in Aid of the Widows and Orphans of Clergymen*, the object of which is to provide annuities for the Widows of clergymen, who, through no fault of their own, have died poor, and for their Orphan daughters, who, on account of ill-health or other causes, are unable to obtain a livelihood by hard and honest work. In addition to this, the *Connor Clergy Widows' Society*, limited to the Diocese of Connor; the *Diocesan Society of Dublin, Glendalough, and Kildare, for assisting Widows and Orphans of Clergymen*, similarly limited; the *Irish Clergy Sons' Education Society;* and the *Irish Clergy Daughters' School.* These Societies are worthy of mention, because they furnish valuable evidence of the existence of an *esprit de corps* among Irish Churchmen; and because the Church, by her action in this respect, adopts the language and follows the example of the

Lord of Hosts, who said by the mouth of His prophet Jeremiah—"Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive; and let thy widows trust in me."

Human misery assumes various forms, and one of the first of Christian duties is to endeavour by all possible means to alleviate it. In this respect the Church of Ireland has certainly not failed in her duty. She has her asylums for the Deaf and Dumb, for the Blind, for those of the female sex who have strayed from the path of virtue, for those who have not wandered, but are sorely tempted to do so, and for street Arabs, boys, who, but for the continued exertions of benevolent Christians, would swell the ranks of the criminal classes, and would become inmates of our gaols. Her Temperance Societies, her Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, her Girls' Friendly Societies, her Ragged Schools, her Hospitals and Infirmaries, and her Asylums for the Aged and for those suffering from incurable disease, are not only flourishing and well-managed, but they are managed for the most part by philanthropic persons, who devote their time, their talents, and their money to the special work in which they feel most interested; who shed over all they do the halo of true religion; and who try, so far as it is possible for them to do so, to make the lives of their suffering fellow-creatures happier, nobler, purer, each day that they live.

The Educational work of the Church is gradually

raising the religious tone of those of her members who, as the present generation passes away, will fill the places left vacant, and will have the guidance of affairs in the future. The *Board of Religious Education in connection with the General Synod;* the *Church Education Society;* and the *Training College for Teachers*, recently established, mainly through the persevering efforts of Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin; are moulding the minds of large numbers of young men and women in such a way as to make them intelligent and well-instructed Christians; and in nearly every parish, both in town and country, periodical examinations of Sunday School children are held, in Holy Scripture and in the Book of Common Prayer. At these examinations the answering is nearly always most creditable, and sometimes remarkably brilliant. The result of this system of teaching and subsequent examination is even now, after the lapse of a few years, quite visible to any ordinary observer. Not only is the Bible now carefully studied by the younger members of our Church, but the Prayer Book, and such portions of Ecclesiastical History as bear upon the Prayer Book, are also studied; the effect of the whole system being to teach the juvenile students to estimate at their full value the privileges which they enjoy, and to unite them more closely than ever to the Church of their fathers. In furthering the work of religious education, as well as, in large measure, sound secular education, no Society has been more useful or more

successful than the *Incorporated Society for Promoting English Protestant Schools in Ireland.*

Let us look now at the work of the Church in quite another sphere: work which devolves upon her by reason of the exceptional position which she occupies.

The Church of Ireland adopted, as we have seen, the principles of the Reformation when, in the Sixteenth Century, those principles began to be diffused throughout Europe. At the same time, owing to the apathy of the English Government, the Irish-speaking population was left without instruction in the Bible and in the Book of Common Prayer; and now, after the lapse of more than three hundred years, we find ourselves, so far as numbers are concerned, in a small minority, whilst four millions of our countrymen profess the faith of Rome. Believing, as we do, that we are right and that they are wrong, and believing, too, that truth is not always on the side of the majority, it is but natural that we should try to persuade our Roman Catholic brethren to become with us members of a truly Apostolic and Scriptural Church.

There are two ways by which we may attain this end. The first, is by discussing in a friendly spirit the differences between us, by controversy on the doctrines held by each Church respectively. I am not prepared to say that this is the better way; but it possesses some advantages. The second, is by laying aside controversy, and agreeing to accept the teaching

of Holy Scripture as binding on each individual Christian, "so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith." Both these methods have been tried by the Church of Ireland, or rather by some earnest individuals within her communion.

Four Societies, having for their special object missionary work among Roman Catholics, have made their mark in the history of the Church. Two of these have restricted themselves to small areas, and have been possessed of comparatively small means; the other two have spread themselves over a larger extent of country, and have carried on their operations on a larger scale. The two smaller agencies are the *Island and Coast Society* and the *Achill Mission*. The former, as its name implies, carries on its work in the islands and on the seashore of Ireland, chiefly in the West and South; the latter, as I have fully shown in my Memoir of the Rev. Edward Nangle, has made the Island of Achill, off the coast of Mayo, the scene of its useful labours. There remain, the Society known as the *Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics*, and the *Irish Society*.

The idea of making an attack on the Church of Rome by open and public controversy originated with an estimable English clergyman, the Rev. Alexander Dallas, who, having in early life served in the army, brought his military experience to bear on his

spiritual work in Ireland. The weapons employed in this warfare have been placards, handbills, and newspaper advertisements, in which the doctrines of Rome have been contrasted with the statements of Holy Scripture; and the places selected for attack have been the city of Dublin and a large area of country in the West of Ireland. Whether a Dublin artisan or a Connemara peasant is capable of dealing with matters of controversy, requiring a knowledge of the decrees of the Council of Trent, and a familiar acquaintance with the writings of Bellarmine, Baronius, Alphonsus Liguori, and other theologians, as well as skill in Biblical criticism, appears to me more than doubtful; but the work of the Irish Church Missions has been carried on for very many years past on the hypothesis that no such intellectual difficulty exists among the classes whom it has challenged to prove that Rome is right and that Protestants are wrong; and it is impossible to deny, whatever we may think of the peculiar method adopted to reach Roman Catholics, that they have been to some extent reached, and that these missions have been here and there successful. A spirit of inquiry has certainly been roused, and that implicit confidence in Rome which was once a marked feature in the character of the lower classes in Ireland, no longer exists. There were, some years ago, large numbers of converts from Romanism in Galway, Mayo, and other western counties, of whose sincerity there could be no doubt; whilst in Dublin controversial sermons

and classes attracted many intelligent working-men, and frequently led to their "conversion" to Protestantism. Many of these have emigrated, and of late years the accession to the ranks of the Church of Ireland has not been, by any means, so large as it was formerly. The most successful portion of the work of the Irish Church Missions, however, has been carried on in its Schools and Orphanages. Its educational work is deserving of all praise. Large numbers of boys and girls have been, for many years past, carefully taught and trained in its institutions; and these form a Band of Hope to whom we may look with confidence in days to come. And yet, after all, there will arise in many thoughtful minds two very serious objections to the work of the Irish Church Missions. The first is that, as I have intimated above, missionary work is *not* best carried on by means of controversy, for a man may be an excellent controversialist, and at the same time a very indifferent Christian. The second is that this Society is not a National Society, not a Church of Ireland Society; it is essentially an English Society, having its head-quarters in London, and carrying on its operations here very much as the Church Missionary Society carries on its special work in India or in Africa. It can, therefore, never hope to gain the affections of the Irish peasant, who dislikes what is foreign, and loves everything that is racy of the soil; and who specially dislikes a religion which, as he conceives, comes to him from the Sassenach,

not from his beloved Erin. If the Society for Irish Church Missions had been really an Irish Society, and if it had dealt less in controversy, there is no calculating the amount of good which it would by this time have effected, not only in Dublin and the West, but all through Ireland.

May I now be allowed to show my reader "a more excellent way"?

In 1818 a Society was established in Ireland which was thoroughly National in its aims, and thoroughly in harmony with the native mind. It was called, and is still called, the "Irish Society." Its object was, and is still, the Scriptural Education of Irish Roman Catholics, chiefly through the medium of their own language. By the last Census, taken in 1881, it appears that there are in Ireland 949,932 (nearly 950,000) persons speaking Irish, of whom 351,333 were *under thirty years of age;* and there were 64,167 persons who spoke nothing but Irish. The Irish Society gives to these Irish-speaking people the Bible in *their own language.* It is the only means by which it is possible to communicate religious instruction to those who know no other tongue; and it is the best way in which to reach the minds and hearts of those who, although they understand English as well as Irish, are passionately attached to the ancient Celtic tongue.

It will, however, be said that these Irish-speaking people form, after all, not quite one-fourth of the whole Roman Catholic population of Ireland, not quite one million out of four. True; but then the

Irish Society includes, among the obligations which rest upon it, that of teaching the Word of God, and circulating that Word among the people in the language which they understand, whether that language be English or Irish. In the Mission Daily Schools, English is the language almost exclusively employed. The Scripture Readers are, with few exceptions, bi-linguists. The Missionary Clergymen sometimes conduct Divine Service and preach in English only: but frequently they do so, partly in English and partly in Irish, the congregations being composed, partly of those who understand the one, and partly of those who understand the other language. It now very rarely occurs that the whole service, including the sermon, is conducted in Irish only. In strict conformity with this principle of employing either English or Irish, according to the necessities of the case, a practice was adopted some time ago of encouraging English-speaking Roman Catholics, in districts where both languages were spoken, to commit to memory, and repeat to the superintending clergyman, portions of the Bible in the English Version. This practice will, henceforward, be more generally adopted. In the present state of education in Ireland, Roman Catholics are practically excluded from Scriptural instruction in all primary Schools, and, of course, they do not attend Church Sunday Schools. By the plan mentioned above, the Irish Society will be able to impart valuable instruction in religious truth, not necessarily

and not mainly controversial, to very many who now know little or nothing about the Bible; and thus to steep them to the lips, not in disloyalty, nor in treason, but in the faith of Jesus Christ.

I have already referred to the importance of the Irish language as a means of reaching the native intellect and the native conscience. A few additional words may not be unacceptable in this place.

Many persons who live in Dublin, and in the cities and towns of Ireland, where English is the only language ever heard, have very little idea how the old Celtic tongue is cherished in the sequestered glens and in the mountainous districts of the South and West, and the extreme North-west. Even those among the native population who to their knowledge of Irish have added some acquaintance with English infinitely prefer the Irish as the medium through which they will consent to receive religious instruction. Irish is to them the language of social intercourse, the language of home. Every feeling and sentiment connected with duty, with morality, with worship, is closely interwoven with that language. If consciousness of guilt sting the bosom of an Irish Celt, the anguish of remorse, the terrible picture of future punishment, the brightening hope of mercy, all these pass before his mind clothed in the words which he learned, as a child, at his mother's knee. If he thinks of God, and of His infinite power; if he soars in imagination to Heaven, or sinks to Hell; if he reasons about his own existence, and dwells upon the

possibilities or the probabilities of that which lies beyond the present scene, all his thoughts clothe themselves in the old familiar Irish. In it he dreams at night, and in it he meditates during his waking hours. What is English to him? The language of the market and of the workshop, the language of worldly occupations, not in any sense hallowed or sacred; the language in which he drives hard bargains, and transacts all business that is essentially of the earth, earthy. Such a language utterly fails to convey to his mind the beauty and the grandeur of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and, even when he possesses a competent knowledge of English, these grand truths, before they reach his Celtic intellect, undergo a process of mental translation which robs them of much of their power.

You can do anything with the Irish peasant if you will but speak to him in Irish. The Irish language has often hitherto been used to express sentiments of disloyalty, of disaffection to England, of superstition. Make the *Bible* speak in that language, and you make it at once the language of loyalty, of obedience to the law, of truth.

It is this great fact which, for the last sixty-seven years, the Irish Society has steadily kept in view; and it is because this fact has been kept in view that the work of the Irish Society has been so practical, so useful, so successful, so evidently prospered and blessed by the Great Head of the Church.

Yes; not at home only, but abroad. Take up

some of the old Reports. Read them through hastily. Tot up the figures they contain. Bring to bear upon them your knowledge of statistics. Then draw your conclusion. It will probably be, "Little or nothing has been done." Would that be a fair conclusion? Certainly not. Look a little further. You see a church built, and a congregation worshipping within the walls of that church in the far West—not of Ireland—but of the United States of America—and you ascertain that this is the direct result of the work of the Irish Society at home. And later on you hear news from Africa, from the islands of the Indian Archipelago, from China, from Japan. You hear of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, preached to our fellow-countrymen in distant lands, through the medium of the "Irish text" published and sent forth by the Irish Society, and accepted by them to the salvation of their immortal souls.

These two Societies, the Society for Irish Church Missions and the Irish Society, have undoubtedly earned the gratitude, each in its own way, of every true-hearted member of the Church of Ireland.

Let me here quote the words of Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, in his admirable Introduction to my Memoir of the Rev. Edward Nangle. "When we speak of our Church," His Grace says, "being intrusted with a mission to Roman Catholics, we simply mean that, in obedience to the outgoings of Christian love, she is bound to deliver this same message, not merely to her own flock, but to those, also, who are without her fold. We mean, in other

words, that it is our solemn duty to approach our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, not, indeed, as heathens, but as Christian brethren, and to adjure them in a spirit of love, for the sake of our common Lord and Master, as they honour His Name, and value their own souls, to escape from out those dark clouds of human tradition whereby His glory is obscured and His Gospel well-nigh hid, and to enjoy, in all its fulness, the light which His Holy Word reveals, and the liberty wherewith He can make us free. Nor do I see why such an appeal should be resented by our brethren of the Church of Rome. We certainly do not honour them the less when they endeavour to bring us within what they believe to be the only safe fold, and we may, I think, claim and expect the exhibition of a similar spirit on their part towards us." All who take really correct views of missionary work will, I should hope, concur in what is here said respecting the attitude in which we stand to our Roman Catholic brethren.

The Church of Ireland, mindful of the work which lies before her at home, has not forgotten the command of her Lord, to "make disciples of all nations."

On the 3rd of May, 1881, the following Resolution was passed by the General Synod :—"That a Board of Missions be appointed, consisting of Members of the General Synod, whose duty it shall be to lay before the Synod, at its Session in each year, a report of what has been done in the several Dioceses in Ireland during the year preceding in support of

Missions in Foreign Parts, and to make such suggestions as may seem advisable."

As soon as the Board was constituted, queries were issued to the Secretaries of five principal Missionary Societies, and the replies to those queries prove conclusively that the Church of Ireland is exerting herself for the spread of the Gospel in distant countries to an extent which must be regarded as marvellous, when we take into consideration the small number of her members, and the many pecuniary burdens which rest on them.

In order to exhibit the progress of the cause of Foreign Missions in Ireland, the Board published, among other information, a statement of receipts for the ten years immediately *preceding*, and also for the ten years immediately *following*, the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church.

It will be remembered that the Irish Church Act came into operation on January 1st, 1871.

From 1861 to 1870, both years inclusive :—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts received in Ireland ... | £23,630 | 11 | 5 |
| The Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East ... ... ... | 63,786 | 6 | 0 |
| The Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews ... ... ... | 43,939 | 16 | 11 |
| The Colonial and Continental Church Society | 6,764 | 18 | 3 |
| The South American Mission* ... ... | 2,506 | 5 | 1 |
| Total | £140,627 | 17 | 8 |

(These sums include legacies.)

* From 1866 to 1870 ; no information previous to 1866.

From 1871 to 1881, both years inclusive :—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts received ... ... | £19,167 | 8 | 5 |
| The Church Missionary Society ... ... | 67,136 | 19 | 2 |
| The Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews ... ... ... | 35,363 | 6 | 8 |
| The Colonial and Continental Church Society | 7,756 | 5 | 11 |
| The South American Mission ... ... | 7,859 | 19 | 1 |
| Total | £137,283 | 19 | 3 |

Showing a decrease of only £3,343 18s. 5d., notwithstanding all the heavy burdens thrown on the Church during that decade.

From these sums the expenses of collection and salaries to officials have to be deducted; but, after this deduction is made, there remains a very large nett result.

In 1881 the total returned as collected for Foreign Missions, including the sum of £233 17s. 5d. for the South African (Bloemfontein) Mission, was £13,220 12s. 9d. If we set down *thirteen thousand pounds* per annum as the average amount contributed by the Church of Ireland for foreign missionary work, we shall be quite within the mark; and this sum, let the reader remember, is contributed in addition to the large amounts required for Home work, and for the support of the Parochial Clergy.

It must be borne in mind that besides the Societies to which I have alluded above, there are many

minor but very useful Societies which are engaged in various works of charity, and which are liberally supported; and there are, in addition, several, such as the Hibernian Bible Society, and the Scripture Readers' Society, which include among their supporters large numbers of Dissenters, but which are also, to a great extent, assisted by members of the Church. And lastly, there is a Society of a novel and interesting character, which owes its existence to the Archbishop of Dublin, Lord Plunket, and which is therefore in close and intimate connection with the Church of Ireland—the Spanish and Portuguese Church Aid Society. It is more than probable that this Society will before long become the means by which a connecting link shall be permanently established between Ireland on the one hand, and Spain and Portugal on the other, and through the medium of which a great Reformation movement shall be inaugurated in those countries. If an Episcopal Church, similar to the Church of Ireland in government and identical with her in doctrine, were once firmly established in the Spanish Peninsula, the influence of that Church would certainly extend to Italy, and possibly even to France.

There can be very little doubt that our Church has before her a grand and glorious future. Some pessimists talk as if her days were numbered, and predict that she will soon be blotted out of existence; but those who know anything of her past history and of her present condition, are justified in coming to the

conclusion that God is reserving her to be, before long, not only historically, but numerically, the Church of Ireland. Men will, as education progresses, and the human mind becomes emancipated, break loose from the chains with which Rome seeks to bind them; and Irish Romanists will naturally gravitate towards a Church which is at once National and Catholic.

Each year since she was disestablished the Church has made some progress. She has been gradually adapting her ministrations to meet the growing wants of the people by whom she is surrounded. Her services are bright and hearty. The sermons addressed to her congregations are plain, practical, and seldom wanting in eloquence. Her clergy, unlike some of those of bygone days, are untiring in their endeavours to promote the spiritual welfare of the people committed to their charge.

One of the great aids towards the promotion of pure religion has been the establishment of Parochial Missions. These have been carried out in many parts of Ireland, and God's blessing has manifestly rested on them. There has been in connection with these efforts no wild enthusiasm, no excitement, no sensationalism, but calm, serious, earnest preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and fervent prayer for the outpouring of God's Holy Spirit, coupled with devout thanksgiving and solemn praise. Occasionally some well-known mission preacher has been invited over from England—the Rev. W. Hay Aitken, for

instance—but as a rule these missions have been conducted by the Parochial Clergy, aided by friends whom they have invited from various parts of the country, to share with them the labour and also the consolation connected with the work.

Another great aid has been the formation of a goodly band of persons, of all ages, who are pledged either to abstain totally from intoxicating drinks, or to be very temperate in the use of them. The Church of Ireland Temperance Society now possesses 625 branches, and has enlisted about 85,000 members; a powerful army, the influence of which must make itself felt. It is quite possible, of course, to be temperate in the use of alcoholic stimulants, or to abstain from them altogether, without being a true Christian; and yet temperance is undoubtedly a Christian virtue; and he who is faithful to the principles of a Temperance Society is likely to rise higher and higher in the Christian life, until he attains "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Amidst the distractions of parochial work, especially in cities and large towns, it is often hard to find time and opportunity for special meditation and prayer, and sometimes impossible to take counsel with your fellow-workers, and to seek their friendly advice. In order to afford this opportunity to the clergy, the practice of having "Quiet Days" has lately been followed with very beneficial results in England; and the Church of Ireland has not been

slow to imitate the example of her sister. "Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place," said Christ to His disciples, "and rest awhile." Surely if a short period of retirement from the world and its duties was necessary to our Lord's Apostles, it must be necessary, amidst the wear and tear, the worries and anxieties of life, in this Nineteenth Century.

Quite recently, therefore (on Rogation Tuesday, 12th May, 1885), the Archbishop of Dublin invited a number of his clergy to spend a Quiet Day with him in Christ Church Cathedral, and the invitation was gladly accepted. One who was present says:—"Who will venture to say that it was *not* good for him to be there? and if it was so for the pastors, how much more so for the people committed to their charge?"

A correspondent of the *Church Times*, quoted in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* of June 6th, 1885, says in his description of a Quiet Day in Dublin:—"The services began with a celebration of Holy Communion at 8 a.m., at which more than forty were present, the numbers increasing gradually during the day, until at the final address they had nearly doubled. The introductory address was delivered by the Archbishop, and was admirably suited to the occasion. Prefacing his remarks with a few words calculated to remove any misunderstanding or suspicion as to the object of their meeting together, His Grace reminded the assembled clergy of the frequent periods of retirement in the busy life of our

Lord, and explained the purpose of a Quiet Day by a happy, if somewhat homely, illustration. 'You will have seen,' he said, 'on our Channel steamers how the weary stoker, busy at the furnace, amid the clanging and throbbing of the engines, occasionally comes up the ladder to rest, and lean his arms on the rail, and lets the cool breeze fan his grimy brow. There, pausing for a while in that purer atmosphere, he sees how the great ship has travelled on her course while he was at his work below, and he looks back at her track in the foaming waters, and forward to the haven where his dear ones await him, and then, refreshed and encouraged, goes back to his labour.' There is no need to describe how the Archbishop brought home his illustration; but he laid special stress on the double aspect of the meditations during the day—*to look back upon the past, and forward to the future.*

"Breakfast, in the music-room attached to the Cathedral, followed at nine o'clock; and the clergy gathered again for meditation and silent prayer at half-past ten. This was followed again by the Matins of the Cathedral, and an Address, delivered by Canon Wynne, on 'The Private Life of the Clergy.' The address was earnest and practical, taking for the central thought the words, 'He ordained twelve that they should be with him.' 'Just as it is said that the roots of some trees correspond, in extent and number, to the branches, so the life of the minister will bear fruit upward in his public ministry in pro-

portion as it is rooted in Christ in his private life.' He reviewed, one by one, the difficulties of the social life of the clergy, the need of precaution against morbidness or laxity, the subtle flattery which always surrounds them, the need of continual realised communion with Christ. 'What we are in the parish depends on what we are in the home and in the study.' An interval followed for silent prayer, at the close of which the Archbishop pronounced the benediction."

Every true friend of the Church of Ireland, on reading this simple narrative of facts, will fervently pray that many such Quiet Days may be spent in the future by her Bishops and Clergy.

Just as the year 1883 was drawing to a close, another of the Church's standard-bearers was struck down by the hand of death; the Right Rev. William Fitzgerald, D.D., Bishop of Killaloe, Kilfenora, Clonfert, and Kilmacduagh. He died at the Episcopal residence, Clarisford House, Killaloe, in the seventieth year of his age. He was the son of the late Dr. Maurice Fitzgerald of Limerick, brother of Baron Fitzgerald, and father of Mr. G. F. Fitzgerald, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. The Bishop entered Trinity College in 1830, obtaining second place at entrance. His College Tutor was the late Bishop O'Brien, to whose distinguished career I have alluded in a former chapter. In 1833 he obtained a Scholarship in the same class with the Rev. Joseph Carson, D.D., and the Rev. Thomas Stack, M.A.,

now Senior Fellow. His first clerical appointment was to the curacy of Lackagh, Diocese of Kildare. He afterwards became Curate of Clontarf, then Rector of Donoughmore, and afterwards Vicar of St. Anne's, Dublin, and Chaplain to Archbishop Whately. Thence he was promoted to the living of Monkstown, near Dublin, and at the same time to the Archdeaconry of Kildare. In 1857, at the request of Archbishop Whately, he was appointed Bishop of Cork by Lord Carlisle, and in 1862 he accepted the Bishopric of Killaloe. Bishop Fitzgerald was a man of great and diversified learning, an insatiable reader, and a logical, if not an eloquent, speaker. He was the Editor of *Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics*, and of *Butler's Analogy;* and the author of a volume of Sermons. He was for some time Professor of Moral Philosophy, and afterwards of Ecclesiastical History, in Trinity College. Whilst as Bishop of Killaloe he always took care to extend his patronage to the two great foreign Missionary Societies of the Church, he used playfully to remark that the S. P. G. ought to be called the *Church* Missionary Society, and that the C. M. S. ought to be called the Society for the Propagation of the *Gospel*.

A very interesting episode in our Church History took place when Dr. Fitzgerald was Bishop of Cork.

Certain dissenters—whether they were Plymouth Brethren or not does not appear—having set on foot prayer-meetings, and other religious services, in the Athenæum, in Cork, resolved that they would obtain,

by all means, the countenance of the Bishop and his clergy. One clergyman only seems to have joined them; but a great many of the laity were caught in the net spread out for them. The Bishop thereupon felt it his duty to write and publish a letter on the subject, addressed to the "Laity of Cork in communion with the United Church of England and Ireland." He says:—"Many, perhaps most of you, must have seen or heard of the tokens of a busy agitation which appears intended by exhortations, by taunts, by menaces of popular displeasure, or by other still more unworthy means, to lead or drive me and the clergy of these Dioceses to approve, or without approving, to join in certain meetings for open and common prayer, conducted, in many cases, by persons unauthorised by our (or as far as I can learn) by *any* Church, and in any form of words (except our public Liturgy) that may seem fit, at the moment of uttering them to the conductors themselves. So far has this agitation been carried, that advice has been publicly given, and industriously circulated, that no Rent-charge should be paid to me, or my clergy, until we, one and all, attend these meetings, called by we know not whom, and managed we know not how."

This statement, the truth of which is unquestionable, forces upon us the conclusion that the tactics of the Land League were first adopted for the furtherance of certain religious views.

The Bishop then proceeds to discuss the whole subject of public extempore prayer. His letter is

specially valuable at the present time. One paragraph is well worth remembering; that in which the writer shows how, under the form of prayer, dangerous heresies may be disseminated, and obtain a hold upon the minds of worshippers. He says:—"Our prayers not only express our religious convictions and feelings, but they shape and fix them. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the convictions and the feelings which our prayers express should be correct and pure. I believe that there is more of common current popular theology derived from prayers and hymns than from all the sermons that are preached. Now religious error, when suggested in the language of prayer or the forms of devotion, is indeed, Satan stealing upon us in the garb of an Angel of Light. When it meets us in the form of a direct statement, it challenges scrutiny, it addresses our judgments immediately, and we are, in some degree, prepared by the very form it wears to question and examine it. But when couched in the language of adoration, we are all too ready to admit it without suspicion. The mind, warmed and won by the apparent piety of the sentiments which surround it, is thrown off its guard. We feel as if nothing which seems to be leading our souls up to Heaven deserved to be mistrusted; and we forget that the Evil One, too, may come among the Sons of God to present himself before the Throne of the Most High. How many have been led astray, and are daily led astray, by such delusions as these, and because they have

felt their hearts 'burn within them' at some imposing rite, or the spell of some impassioned words of prayer or praise, have surrendered themselves blindly to the force of feelings which they mistook for piety, and never asked the reasons whether all the while the service in which they were engaged might not have been 'the sacrifice of fools.'"

Bishop Fitzgerald was succeeded by the Ven. William Bennett Chester, D.D., Archdeacon of Killaloe, and Rector of Birr, otherwise Parsonstown. Bishop Chester's father was a clergyman in the Diocese of Cork, and he himself has laboured in the ministry of the Irish Church for nearly forty years. In conjunction with his lately deceased brother, the Rev. Richard Chester, Treasurer of Cloyne Cathedral, and Rector of Middleton, the Bishop published, some years ago, a volume of historical and miscellaneous poems, and twice he obtained Vice-Chancellor's Prizes in Trinity College for English Poetry. He has held several important parochial charges. In 1877 he was elected by the Diocesan Synod to the Canonry in St. Patrick's Cathedral to represent the Diocese of Killaloe, and Bishop Fitzgerald shortly after selected him to fill the important office of Archdeacon of Killaloe. The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* correctly describes Dr. Chester as "a representative Irish clergyman; a Prayer Book Churchman of the Evangelical School, true to the Catholic Faith, and not ashamed to be called a Protestant."

Early in 1884 another venerable Irish bishop was

summoned to his rest. Bishop Darley, of Kilmore, whom I have mentioned in a former chapter, died at the See House, Kilmore, on Sunday, 20th January, 1884. Appointed, as I have already said, to the episcopate at the age of seventy-five, it was thought at the time that he was unfit for the labours and cares of his office; but all who knew him know that during the ten years which were added to his life he justified the confidence of the United Synods which elected him, by earning the reputation of being one of the most active and hard-working bishops on the Irish Bench. His energies never flagged. He influenced and stimulated his clergy by his example, his energy, and zeal; and he always felt and expressed for them a fraternal kindness and sympathy which left nothing to be desired.

I have in a former chapter quoted the exclamation of the Roman Catholic priest who stood beside the grave of good Bishop Bedel—*Sit anima mea cum Bedelio.* "Is there anything," asks the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette,* "in the atmosphere of Kilmore that disagrees with the *odium theologicum?* It was something not to be forgotten when the Most Rev. Dr. Conaty shook hands with the Most Rev. Lord Plunket over the open grave of Dr. Darley. The secret, no doubt, is the same in both instances. It was the spirit of love that broke down the barrier between the representatives, alas! of opposing churches; and it was the memory of the loving face of the late Bishop, and of his warm and honest

heart, that led these two prelates to the interchange of brotherly greetings on this solemn occasion."

Bishop Darley's successor is the Right Rev. Samuel Shone, D.D. He was consecrated in Christ Church Cathedral, on Friday, 25th April, 1884, by Archbishop Trench (then Archbishop of Dublin), assisted by the Bishops of Meath, Down, Derry, Ossory, and Killaloe. The sermon was preached by the Very Rev. W. C. Townsend, Dean of Tuam. Bishop Shone was for many years Incumbent of Calry, Sligo, in the Diocese of Elphin, then Rector of Urney (Cavan), and Archdeacon of Kilmore, so that he has spent the whole of his ministerial life in the United Diocese over which he now presides.

One other change in the constitution of the Episcopal Bench remains to be recorded. At the close of the year 1884, Archbishop Trench, whose name is known and revered in every part of that great British Empire on whose flag the sun never sets, resigned the office which he had held for twenty-one years, during one of the most important periods in the history of the Church of Ireland, and Lord Plunket, Bishop of Meath, was unanimously elected in his place Archbishop of Dublin.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. William Conyngham, Lord Plunket, D.D., is a Baron of the United Kingdom. He is the eldest son of the third Baron Plunket, and nephew of the late Lord Plunket, Bishop of Tuam. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he graduated B.A., 1853; M.A.,

1864; and D.D., 1876. He was ordained Deacon in 1857, and Priest the following year, by his uncle the Bishop of Tuam. In 1858 he was promoted to the Incumbency of Kilmoylan, and in 1859 he was appointed Domestic Chaplain and Private Secretary to the Bishop of Tuam, as well as Honorary Secretary of the West Connaught Church Endowment Society. This Society has erected and endowed a considerable number of churches in the West of Ireland. In 1864 Lord Plunket was appointed Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and in 1869 Precentor. He has also been a Diocesan Nominator and a Member of the Council for the Diocese of Dublin. In 1876 he was, as I have already said, elected Bishop of Meath; and on January 1st, 1885, he succeeded Archbishop Trench in the Archiepiscopal See of Dublin.

On Wednesday, 4th February, 1885, the Diocesan Synod of Meath met in Dublin, and returned to the Bench of Bishops for selection the names of the Rev. Dr. Bell, Rector of Kells, and the Very Rev. Dr. Reichel, Dean of Clonmacnois. These two clergymen obtained a sufficient number of votes to place them on the select list; but neither obtained a majority of two-thirds of both orders, Clerical and Lay. An objection, however, was lodged against the return, on the ground that, owing to the decision of the Assessor, the Synod was deprived of a right which it was entitled to exercise of sending a third name to the Bench of Bishops. The matter was accordingly referred to the Court of the General

Synod on the 1st June; and after the question had been fully argued, the Court resolved to advise the Bench of Bishops that "the return made to them by the Synod of Meath is illegal and void, and of course the Synod will be again convened for the election of a Bishop."

The Synod met for the second time on the 15th June; the same two names were returned, and no objection being now raised on the score of illegality, the names were sent forward to the Bench of Bishops, who, on August 19th, declared the Very Rev. Charles Parsons Reichel, D.D., duly elected to fill the office of Bishop of Meath.

Dr. Reichel was born in Yorkshire. He was educated at the University of Berlin and at Trinity College, Dublin, where he obtained a Scholarship in 1841, and a Senior Classical Moderatorship in 1843. He is a member of the Senate of the University, and has recently filled the office of Professor of Ecclesiastical History. In 1854 he was Donnellan Lecturer; and he has frequently been Select Preacher both at Oxford and Cambridge. In 1850 he was appointed Professor of Latin in the Queen's College, Belfast. In 1864 he was selected for the Vicarage of All Saints, Mullingar, in the gift of the Crown; and subsequently he became Canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, representing the Diocese of Meath, Rector of Trim, and Archdeacon of Meath, and finally Dean of Clonmacnois.

On Tuesday, September 29th, the Feast of St.

Michael and All Angels, he was consecrated Bishop of Meath in St. Patrick's Cathedral, the consecrating prelates being the Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishops of Down, Kilmore, and Killaloe.

"Of the new Bishop of Meath's European fame," says the *Meath Parochial Magazine*, "we need scarcely speak. He is known everywhere as a great and eloquent preacher, and he is in very truth an earnest and unanswerable Defender of the Faith. He is a representative of whom the Church of Ireland may be justly proud, and one who will command the utmost respect and admiration in the Sister Isle."

Let me now put the finishing stroke to this Sketch.

I have endeavoured to show, and I hope I have succeeded in showing, that the historical continuity of the Church of Ireland has been preserved throughout her eventful history of fourteen hundred and fifty years. In the language of the learned and judicious Hooker:—"Let our first demand be that in the external form of religion such things as are apparently or can be sufficiently proved effectual and generally fit to set forward godliness, either as betokening the greatness of God, or as beseeming the dignity of Religion, or as concurring with celestial impressions in the minds of men, may be reverently thought of; some few, rare, casual, and tolerable or otherwise curable inconveniences notwithstanding. Neither may we in this case *lightly*

*esteem what hath been allowed as fit in the judgment of antiquity, and by the long-continued practice of the whole Church:* from which unnecessarily to swerve experience never, as yet, has found it safe."

The Church of Ireland, founded in the Fifth Century, Reformed in the Sixteenth, and flourishing with all the vigour of youth in the Nineteenth Century, is "an external form of religion which has been proved to be effectual to set forth godliness" within this land; and her great boast is that she neither "lightly esteems what has been allowed as fit in the judgment of antiquity," nor does she in her teaching and in her discipline depart from the long-continued practice of the whole, that is the Catholic or Universal Church.

She is not the Church of the majority of the people of Ireland, but she is, nevertheless, the National Church; because she can trace her descent in one unbroken line from the days of St. Patrick.

The total population of Ireland, according to the Census of 1881, is 5,174,836. Of these 3,960,891 (nearly four millions) are Roman Catholics; 639,574 (nearly 640 thousand) are members of the Church of Ireland; 470,734 are Presbyterians; 48,839 Methodists; and 54,798 belong to other religious bodies.

It may, therefore, seem very presumptuous to claim for a body which numbers only 640,000 out of a population of more than 5,000,000, the exclusive title of Church of Ireland. The question, however, is not one of numbers, but of historical fact. The

Church of England is quite outnumbered by all the dissenting sects put together, and yet no well-informed person can deny that she is the National Church of England. Napoleon I. used impiously to say that God was always on the side of the largest battalions. In spiritual matters it will generally be found that *truth* is not on the side of the largest numbers. Until it can be proved that the Church for which we now claim the title "Church of Ireland" is not historically the Church which was planted in this country by St. Patrick, we shall feel it our duty to retain the title, and to reject any other by which we may be called.

At a meeting of the Representative Church Body, held in Dublin, on January 24th, 1871, the following Report on the claim of the Church to be regarded as the Church of Ireland was presented by the Legal Committee, and unanimously adopted. With this clearly expressed decision, which possesses equal force now, I leave this my "historical sketch" to the judgment of my readers.

"The Church of Ireland is entitled to, and is bound to use, the name of THE CHURCH OF IRELAND, and is not entitled to assume or to use, and ought not to accept the name of *The Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland*, or any other name than THE CHURCH OF IRELAND. The Church of Ireland, which the Registrar-General of Marriages has designated *The Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland*, has been ever since the Reformation the only CHURCH

OF IRELAND, as well in fact as in law. The Roman Catholic Church has never been the Church of Ireland. It has been the Church of Rome, and has assumed to be *The Catholic Church.* All other bodies of professing Christians in Ireland have been Congregational Churches or Institutions *in* Ireland, and have neither been nor have claimed to be Churches *of* Ireland. The name CHURCH OF IRELAND is the name uniformly given by the Irish and Imperial Legislatures to the Church of Ireland. See 28 Henry VIII., c. 5, 17; and 18 Car. II., c. 6; 6 Geo. I., c. 3; 14 and 15 Vict., c. 72. Also the Act of Union, and the Irish Church Act, 1869, ss. 1, 2, and 69, &c., &c. Neither the Legislature, nor any other lawful authority, has given to, or assumed to impose upon, the Church of Ireland any new name. On the contrary, the name CHURCH OF IRELAND, both by recital and by the repeated words 'the said Church,' is incorporated into the new Marriage Act, 33 and 34 Vict., c. 110. The words '*Protestant Episcopalian*,' which occur in this Act, are not used for the nomenclature of members of the Church of Ireland, but as a comprehensive term proper to include members of all other Protestant Episcopal Churches, as well as the CHURCH OF IRELAND, which is one of numerous Protestant Episcopal Churches. On the other hand, in this Act, the various religious bodies of Nonconformists connected with Ireland, are mentioned under the various names adopted by themselves. THE CHURCH OF IRELAND and the Roman

Catholic Church are the only ecclesiastical institutions in Ireland which comprehend Ireland. These *do* include within their functions all Ireland divided into parishes. The Roman Catholic Church claims for itself *hic et ubique* the name of *The Catholic Church,* and disdains limits of country and place; and indeed could not without inconsistency assume the name of

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND."

---

When the last pages of this book were being printed, the following letter was forwarded to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, by Sir Robert Hamilton, Under-Secretary to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, and published in the Dublin daily papers:—

DUBLIN CASTLE,
10*th October*, 1885.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,

I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant, in reference to previous communications, to apprise Your Grace that he has thought it right to obtain, for his information and guidance, the opinion of the law officers of the Crown on the subject of the legality of the title "Church of Ireland," and I am now, by his direction, to send Your Grace a copy of that opinion.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord Archbishop,
Your Grace's most obedient Servant,
R. G. C. HAMILTON.

The opinion referred to above is signed by the Right Hon. Hugh Holmes, M.P., Attorney-General, and Mr. John Monroe, Q.C., Solicitor-General, and is as follows:—

We are of opinion that this matter has been practically settled by the Legislature, and that the title of the Disestablished Church in Ireland is "The Church of Ireland." We do not think it necessary to refer to any of the Statutes prior to the Irish Church Act, 1869, by which the Establishment of the Church of Ireland was put an end to. It will be observed that this Act is entitled "An Act to put an End to the Establishment of the Church of Ireland." It recites in the preamble that "it is expedient that the union created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland, as by law established, should be dissolved, and that the '*Church of Ireland*,' as so separated, should cease to be established by law." The second section provides that the union created between the Churches of England and Ireland should be dissolved, and that *the said Church of Ireland*, thereinafter referred to as the said Church, should cease to be established by law.

By a subsequent section of the same Act it is provided that "In all enactments, deeds, and other documents in which mention is made of the United Church of England and Ireland, the enactments relating thereto shall be read distributively in respect of the Church of England and the *Church of Ireland*." We find in this statute a clear indication by the Legislature that, although the Church is to cease to be established, the name of the "Church of Ireland" is to be preserved. This is recognised by subsequent Statutes. The Act of 38 Vic., c. 11, recites in the preamble that it is expedient to extend certain benefits to the late established Church of Ireland, and throughout the statute the words used are either "the late Established Church of Ireland," or

"the said Church." Again, in a statute dealing with public and parochial records (38 and 39 Vic., c. 59), the expression "parochial officer" is, by the interpretation clause, defined to mean "any rector, vicar, curate, parish clerk, or other parish officer of the *Church of Ireland.*" A statute passed in 1884 (47 Vic., c. 10) to amend the Irish Church Act, 1869, recognises the title by such phrases as the following:—"having regard to the altered circumstances of the *said Irish Church;*" "or in any other manner for the benefit of the *said Irish Church.*"

Thus it will be seen that both in the Act of Disestablishment, and in subsequent legislation, either dealing with or referring to the Disestablished Church, the Legislature has given or recognised the term "Church of Ireland," or its equivalent "the Irish Church," as that by which it is to be denominated.

We are, therefore, of opinion that "the Church of Ireland" is the legal title.

(Signed),

HUGH HOLMES.
JOHN MONROE.

29*th September*, 1885.

# APPENDIX.

BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT TIME; THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS—1535 TO 1885.

Compiled, up to 1854, from the *Irish Church Journal.*

## INTRODUCTION.

George Browne was consecrated to the See of Dublin at Lambeth, 19th March, 1535-6, by Thomas Canterbury (Cranmer), Nicholas Salisbury (Shaxton), and John Rochester (Hilsey).

Thomas Lancaster, to the See of Kildare, at Dublin, July, 1550, by G. Dublin (Browne).

Hugh Goodacre, to Armagh, and John Bale, to Ossory, in Christ Church, Dublin, 2nd February, 1552-3, by G. Dublin (Browne), T. Kildare (Lancaster), and E. Down (Magennis).

Hugh Curwen was consecrated to the See of Dublin, in London, 8th September, 1555.

Adam Loftus, to the See of Armagh, 2nd March, 1562-3, by H. Dublin (Curwen), and other Bishops. He was translated to Dublin in 1567.

Thomas Lancaster, to the See of Armagh, at Christ Church, Dublin, 13th June, 1568, by A. Dublin (Loftus), H. Meath (Brady), and R. Kildare (Daly).

Thomas Jones, to Meath, at St. Patrick's, Dublin, 12th May, 1584. As Archbishop Lancaster was either dying or dead, and Dr. Jones was brother-in-law to Archbishop Loftus, the latter probably officiated. Translated to Dublin in 1605.

Christopher Hampton was consecrated to Armagh, at St. Patrick's, Dublin, 8th May, 1613, by T. Dublin (Jones), G. Meath (Montgomery), W. Kildare (Pilsworth), and J. Killaloe (Rider). And Jonas Wheeler to Ossory at the same time and place.

Launcelot Bulkeley, to Dublin, at St. Peter's Church, Drogheda, 3rd October, 1619, by C. Armagh (Hampton), T. Kilmore (Moyne), and T. Dromore (Buckworth).

James Ussher, to Meath,* at St. Peter's Church, Drogheda, 1621, by C. Armagh (Hampton), T. Kilmore (Moyne), R. Down (Echlin), and T. Dromore (Buckworth). Translated to Armagh in 1624.

---

### Reign of Charles II.

Archbishop of Armagh and Primate, Dr. John Bramhall; translated on 18th January, 1660-1, from Derry, to which See he had been consecrated in Dublin Castle Chapel on 26th May, 1634, by James Armagh (Ussher), Anthony Meath (Martin), Robert Down (Echlin), and Richard Cork (Boyle).

---

* The Bishop of Meath takes precedence of the Irish Bishops, as the Bishop of London does of the English. The Bishop of Kildare used to rank next, as the Bishop of Durham does in England.

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| James Margetson. Trans. to Armagh, 1663 ... ... | Dublin ... ... | St. Patrick's Cathedral ... | 27th Jan., 1660-61 |
| Samuel Pullen ... ... | Tuam ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Michael Boyle. Trans. to Dublin, 1663, and Armagh, 1678 ... | Cork ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Jeremiah Taylor ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Robert Price ... ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| George Wild ... ... ... | Derry ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Edward Synge. Trans. to Cork, 1663 ... ... ... | Limerick ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| John Parker. Trans. to Tuam, 1667, and Dublin, 1678 ... | Elphin ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Henry Hall ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| George Baker ... ... ... | Waterford ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Robert Leslie. Trans. to Raphoe, 1661, and Clogher, 1671 ... | Dromore ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Edward Worth ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Thomas Price. Trans. to Cashel, 1667 ... ... ... | Kildare ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 10th March, 1660-61 |
| William Fuller. Trans. to Lincoln, 1667 ... ... ... | Limerick ... ... | ,, ... | 20th March, 1663-64 |
| Thomas Bayly ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | Tuam Cathedral ... | Trinity Sunday, 5th June, 1664 |
| Edward Wolley ... ... | Clonfert ... ... | ,, ... | 16th April, 1665 |
| Hugh Gore ... ... ... | Waterford, &c. ... | Cashel Cathedral ... | 25th March, 1666 |
| Robert Mossom ... ... | Derry ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 1st April, 1666 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Richard Boyle ... ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 10th Jan., 1666-67 |
| Ambrose Jones ... ... | Kildare ... ... | ,, ... | 29th June, 1667 |
| John Hudson ... ... ... | Elphin ... ... | St. Nicholas', Galway ... | 8th Sept., 1667 |
| Roger Boyle. Trans. to Clogher, 1672 ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | St. Luke's Day, 18th Oct., 1667 |
| George Rush ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | ,, ... | 15th Dec., 1667 |
| Francis Marsh. Trans. to Kilmore, 1672, and Dublin, 1681 ... | Limerick ... ... | St. Mary's, Clonmel ... | 22nd Dec., 1667 |
| Daniel Witter ... ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | Parish Church, Cashel ... | Sept., 1669 |
| Thomas Otway. Trans. to Ossory, 1679 ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | ,, ... | 29th Jan., 1670-71 |
| Essex Digby ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 27th Feb., 1670-71 |
| Ezekiel Hopkins. Trans to Derry, 1681 ... ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | ,, ... | 27th Oct., 1671 |
| John Parry ... ... ... | Ossory ... ... | ,, ... | 28th April, 1672 |
| Thomas Hacket ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | 28th Sept., 1672 |
| John Vesey. Trans. to Tuam, 1678 | Limerick, &c. ... | ,, ... | 12th Jan., 1672-73 |
| John Roan ... ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | Cashel ... ... | June, 1675 |
| Benjamin Parry ... ... | Ossory ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 27th Jan., 1677-78 |
| Michael Ward. Trans. to Derry, 1679 ... ... ... | Ossory ... ... | ,, ... | 24th Nov., 1678 |
| Anthony Dopping. Trans. to Meath, 1681 ... ... | Kildare ... ... | ,, ... | 2nd Feb., 1678-79 |
| Simon Digby. Trs. to Elphin, 1691 | Limerick, &c. ... | ,, ... | 23rd March, 1678-79 |
| Edward Wetenhall. Trans. to Kilmore, 1699 ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Patrick Sheridan ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | Cashel ... ... | 27th April, 1679 |
| John Smith ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | Tuam ... ... | Feb., 1679-80 |
| William Smith. Trans. to Raphoe, 1681; Kilmore, 1693 ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | Tuam ... ... | June, 1681 |
| William Moreton.* Trans. to Meath, 1705 ... ... | Kildare ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 19th Feb., 1681-82 |
| William Sheridan ... ... | Kilmore ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Richard Tennison. Trans. to Clogher, 1690; Meath, 1697 ... | Killala, &c. ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Edward Jones. Trans. to St. Asaph—date uncertain ... | Cloyne ... ... | Cashel Cathedral ... | 11th March, 1682-83 |
| Narcissus Marsh. Trans. to Cashel, 1690; Dublin, 1694; Armagh, 1702 ... ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 6th May, 1683 |
| Capell Wiseman ... ... | Dromore ... ... | ,, ... | 23rd Sept., 1683 |
| William King.* Trans. to Dublin, 1702 ... ... ... | Derry ... ... | ,, ... | 25th Jan., 1690-91 |
| Bartholomew Vigors ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | 8th March, 1690-91 |
| William Fitzgerald ... ... | Clonfert ... ... | ,, ... | 26th July, 1691 |
| Nathaniel Foy ... ... | Waterford, &c. ... | Parish Church of St. Brigid | 9th August, 1691 |
| William Lloyd ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 23rd August, 1691 |
| Nathaniel Wilson ... ... | Limerick, &c. ... | ,, ... | 8th May, 1692 |
| Ulysses Burgh ... ... | Ardagh ... ... | ,, ... | 11th Sept., 1692 |
| William Palliser. Trans. to Cashel, 1694 ... ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 5th March, 1692-93 |

* Founder of Archbishop King's Lectureship in Divinity, now held by the Very Rev. Dean Gwynn.

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alexander Cairncross ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | Consecrated Bp. of Brechin, in Scotland, 1684. Trans. to Glasgow, 1684, and to Raphoe, 1693 ... | |
| Henry Ryder ... ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | Dunboyne ... ... | Trinity Sunday, 11th June, 1693 |
| John Hartstrong ... ... | Ossory ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 2nd July, 1693 |
| Samuel Foley ... ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | 2nd Sept., 1694 |
| Tobias Pullen. Trans. to Dromore, 1695 ... ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | No information ... ... | Day unknown, 1694 |
| St. George Ashe. Trans. to Clogher, 1697; Derry, 1714 ... | Cloyne ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 18th July, 1695 |
| Edward Walkington ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | 4th August, 1695 |
| Thomas Smyth ... ... | Limerick ... ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 8th Dec., 1695 |
| Thomas Lindsay. Trans. to Raphoe, 1713; Armagh, 1713 ... | Killaloe ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 22nd March, 1695-96 |
| John Pooley. Trans. to Raphoe, 1702 ... ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | St. Michan's Ch., Dublin | Dec., 1697 |
| Edward Smith ... ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 2nd April, 1699 |
| Dive Downs ... ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | Cashel ... ... | 4th June, 1699 |
| Robert Huntingdon ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | July, 1701 |
| Charles Crow ... ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | ,, ... | Oct., 1702 |
| Charles Hickman ... ... | Derry ... ... | Dunboyne ... ... | 11th June, 1703 |
| Welbore Ellis. Trans. to Meath, 1732 ... ... ... | Kildare ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 11th Nov., 1705 |
| Thomas Mills ... ... ... | Waterford, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 18th April, 1708 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peter Brown ... ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | No information ... ... | 8th April, 1710 |
| John Sterne. Trans. to Clogher, 1717 ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 10th May, 1713 |
| Sir Thomas Vesey. Trans. to Ossory, 1714 ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 12th July, 1713 |
| Edward Synge. Trans. to Tuam, 1716 ... ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | Dunboyne ... ... | 7th Nov., 1714 |
| Nicholas Foster. Trans. to Raphoe, 1716 ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | ,, ... ... | ,, |
| Timothy Godwin. Trans. to Cashel, 1727 ... ... | Kilmore ... ... | ,, ... ... | 16th Jan., 1714-15 |
| John Evans ... ... ... | Meath ... ... | Cons. Bp. of Bangor, 1701-2. Trans. to Meath, 1715 ... | |
| Charles Carr ... ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | No information ... ... | June, 1716 |
| Ralph Lambert. Trans. to Meath, 1726 ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | Dunboyne ... ... | 23rd April, 1717 |
| Henry Downs. Trans. to Elphin, 1720; Meath, 1724; Derry, 1726 | Killala, &c. ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 12th May, 1717 |
| William Nicholson. Trans. to Cashel, 1721 ... ... | Derry ... ... | Cons. Bp. of Carlisle, 1702. Trans. to Derry, 1718 ... | |
| Charles Cobbe. Trans. to Dromore, 1726; Kildare, 1732; Dublin, 1742 ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 14th August, 1720 |
| Francis Hutchinson ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | Drogheda ... ... | 22nd Jan., 1720-21 |
| Josiah Hort. Trans. to Kilmore, 1727; Tuam, 1742 ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | Castleknock ... ... | Feb., 1721-22 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Theophilus Bolton. Trans. to Elphin, 1724; Cashel, 1729 ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 30th Sept., 1722 |
| Arthur Price. Trans. to Ferns, 1729; Meath, 1733; Cashel, 1744 | Clonfert, &c. ... | ,, ... | 3rd May, 1724 |
| Hugh Boulter ... ... ... | Armagh ... ... | Cons. Bp. of Bristol. 1719. Trans. to Armagh, 17-4 | |
| William Burscough ... ... | Limerick ... ... | Dunboyne ... ... | 20th June, 1725 |
| Henry Maule. Trans. to Dromore, 1734; Meath, 1744 ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | ,, ... ... | 11th Sept., 1726 |
| Robert Howard. Trans. to Elphin, 1729 ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | ,, ... ... | 19th March, 1726-27 |
| John Hoadley. Trans. to Dublin, 1729; Armagh, 1742 ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 3rd Sept., 1727 |
| Robert Clayton. Trans. to Cork, 1735; Clogher, 1745 ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | ,, ... | 10th May, 1730 |
| Edward Synge. Trans. to Cloyne, 1732; Ferns, 1733; Elphin, 1740 | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Werburgh's, Dublin ... | 7th June, 1730 |
| Edward Tennison ... ... | Ossory ... ... | St. Mary's, Dublin ... | 4th July, 1731 |
| Mordecai Cary. Trans. to Killala, 1735 ... ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Anne's, Dublin ... | 26th March, 1733 |
| George Berkeley ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | St. Paul's, Dublin ... | 19th May, 1733 |
| Thomas Rundle ... ... | Derry ... ... | Dunboyne ... ... | 3rd August, 1735 |
| John Whitcomb. Trans. to Down, 1752; Cashel, 1752 ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Peter's, Dublin ... | 4th Jan., 1735-36 |
| Charles Este. Trans. to Waterford, 1740 ... ... ... | Ossory ... ... | St. Werburgh's, Dublin ... | 1st Feb., 1735-36 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carew Reynell. Trans. to Derry, 1743 ... ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 18th Nov., 1739 |
| Joseph Storey. Trans. to Kilmore, 1742 ... ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | St. Bride's, Dublin ... | 10th Feb., 1739-40 |
| George Stone. Trans. to Kildare, 1743; Derry, 1745; Armagh, 1747 | Ferns, &c. ... ... | Chapelizod ... ... | 3rd Aug., 1740 |
| Anthony Dopping ... ... | Ossory ... ... | St. Luke's, Dublin ... | 19th July, 1741 |
| John Ryder. Trans. to Down, 1743; Tuam, 1752 ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | St. Bride's, Dublin ... | 21st Feb., 1741-42 |
| Michael Cox. Trans. to Cashel, 1745 ... ... ... | Ossory ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 29th May, 1743 |
| William Cotterell ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 19th June, 1743 |
| Jemmet Brown. Trans. to Dromore, 1745; Cork, 1745; Elphin, 1772; Tuam, 1775 ... ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | ,, ... | 9th Oct., 1743 |
| Thomas Fletcher. Trans. to Kildare, 1745 ... ... | Dromore ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 10th June, 1744 |
| William Barnard. Trans. to Derry, 1746 ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | St. Michael's, Dublin ... | 19th Aug., 1744 |
| Robert Downes. Trans. to Down, 1752; Raphoe, 1753 ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Richard Chenevix. Trans. to Waterford, 1745 ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 28th July, 1745 |
| George Marlay ... ... | Dromore ... ... | St. Bride's, Dublin ... | 15th Sept., 1745 |
| Nicholas Synge ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | St. Peter's, Dublin ... | 26th Jan., 1745-46 |
| Philip Twisden ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | St. Michan's, Dublin ... | 29th March, 1747 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Richard Robinson. Trans. to Ferns, 1759; Kildare, 1761; Armagh, 1765 ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 19th Jan., 1752 |
| Arthur Smith. Trans. to Down, 1753; Meath, 1765; Dublin, 1766 | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Andrew's, Dublin ... | 5th April, 1752 |
| John Garnett. Trans. to Clogher, 1758 ... ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 12th Nov., 1752 |
| James Stopford ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | St. Ann's, Dublin ... | 11th March, 1753 |
| Hon. W. Carmichael. Trans. to Ferns, 1758; Meath, 1758; Dublin, 1765 ... ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Werburgh's, Dublin ... | 1st April, 1753 |
| Edward Maurice ... ... | Ossory ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 27th Jan., 1754 |
| James Leslie ... ... ... | Limerick ... ... | St. Andrew's, Dublin ... | 16th Nov., 1755 |
| Richard Pocock. Trans. to Meath | Ossory ... ... | St. Peter's, Dublin ... | 21st March, 1756 |
| John Cradock ... ... ... | Kilmore ... ... | St. Michael's, Dublin ... | 4th Dec., 1757 |
| William Gore. Trans. to Elphin, 1762; Limerick, 1772 ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Ann's, Dublin ... | 16th April, 1758 |
| Thomas Salmon ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | St. Bride's, Dublin ... | 11th June, 1758 |
| Samuel Hutchinson ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | St. Andrew's, Dublin ... | 22nd April, 1759 |
| Robert Johnson ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 21st Oct., 1759 |
| Charles Jackson. Trans. to Kildare, 1765 ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | St. Bridget's, Dublin ... | 19th April, 1761 |
| John Oswald. Trans. to Dromore, 1763; Raphoe, 1763 ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Michan's, Dublin ... | 4th July, 1762 |
| Denison Cumberland. Trans. to Kilmore, 1772 ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Audoen's, Dublin ... | 19th June, 1763 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Edward Young. Trans. to Ferns, 1765 ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 16th October, 1763 |
| Hon. H. Maxwell. Trans. to Meath, 1766 ... ... | Dromore ... ... | St. Michael's, Dublin ... | 10th March, 1765 |
| Charles Dodgson. Trans. to Elphin, 1775 ... ... ... | Ossory ... ... | St. Werburgh's, Dublin ... | 11th August, 1765 |
| James Trail, ... ... ... | Down and Connor ... | St. Michan's, Dublin ... | 26th October, 1765 |
| William Newcome. Trans. to Ossory, 1776; Waterford, 1779; Armagh, 1795 ... ... | Dromore ... ... | St. Michan's, Dublin ... | 27th April, 1766 |
| Hon. Frederick Augustus Hervey, afterwards Earl of Bristol. Trans. to Derry, 1768 ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 31st May, 1767 |
| Charles Agar ... ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 20th March, 1768 |
| John Averell ... ... ... | Limerick ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 6th July, 1771 |
| Robert Fowler. Trans. to Dublin, 1778 ... ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 28th July, 1771 |
| Isaac Mann ... ... ... | Cork ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 15th March, 1772 |
| Walter Cope. Trans. to Ferns, 1782 ... ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| Hon. Joseph Deane Bourke. Trans. to Tuam, 1782 ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | St. Thomas's, Dublin ... | 11th October, 1772 |
| George Lewis Jones. Trans. to Kildare, 1790 ... ... | Kilmore ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 22nd January, 1775 |
| James Hawkins. Trans. to Raphoe, 1780 ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 23rd April, 1775 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| George Chinnery. Trans. to Cloyne, 1780 ... ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 7th March, 1779 |
| John Hotham. Trans. to Clogher, 1782 ... ... ... | Ossory ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 14th November, 1779 |
| Thomas Barnard. Trans. to Limerick, 1794 ... ... ... | Killaloe ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 20th February, 1780 |
| Hon. William de la Poer Beresford. Trans. to Ossory, 1782; Tuam, 1794 ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | ,, ... | 9th April, 1780 |
| Richard Woodward ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 4th February, 1781 |
| William Cecil Pery ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 18th February, 1781 |
| Thomas Percy ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 26th May, 1782 |
| John Law. Trans. to Killala, 1787; Elphin, 1795 ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | ,, ... | 21st September, 1712 |
| William Dickson ... ... | Down, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | 1st February, 1784 |
| William Preston ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | ,, ... | 11th November, 1784 |
| Richard Marlay. Trans. to Waterford, 1795 ... ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | ,, ... | 30th December, 1788 |
| Euseby Cleaver. Trans. to Ferns, 1789; Dublin, 1809 ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | 28th March, 1789 |
| William Foster. Trans. to Kilmore, 1790; Clogher, 1796 ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | St. Peter's, Dublin ... | 14th June, 1789 |
| William Bennett. Trans. to Cloyne, 1794 ... ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 13th June, 1790 |
| Hon. Thomas Stopford ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | St. Ann's, Dublin ... | 29th June, 1794 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hon. William Knox. Trans. to Derry, 1803 ... ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | St. Peter's, Dublin ... | 21st September, 1794 |
| Thomas Lewis O'Beirne. Trans. to Meath, 1798 ... ... | Ossory ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 1st February, 1795 |
| Hon. Charles Brodrick. Trans. to Kilmore, 1796; Cashel, 1802 ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 22nd March, 1795 |
| John Porter. Trans. to Clogher, 1798 ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | Tuam Cathedral ... | 7th June, 1795 |
| Hugh Hamilton. Trans. to Ossory, 1798 ... ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 31st January, 1796 |
| Joseph Stock. Trans. to Waterford, 1810 ... ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | ,, ... | 28th June, 1798 |
| Matthew Young ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | ,, ... | 3rd February, 1799 |
| William Stuart ... ... | Armagh ... ... | Consecrated Bishop of St. David's, 12th June, 1794; Trans. to Armagh, 1800 | |
| George de la Poer Beresford. Trans. to Kilmore, 1802 ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Thomas's, Dublin ... | 1st February, 1801 |
| Nathaniel Alexander. Trans. to Killaloe, 1804; Down, 1804; Meath, 1823 ... ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Mark's, Dublin ... | 21st March, 1802 |
| Hon. Power le Poer Trench. Trans. to Elphin, 1810; Tuam, 1819 ... | Waterford, &c. ... | Tuam Cathedral ... | 21st November, 1802 |
| Hon. Charles Dalrymple Lindsay. Trans. to Kildare, 1804 ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 13th November, 1803 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Christopher Butson. Bishop of Killaloe, Clonfert, &c., 1834 ... | Clonfert, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 29th July, 1804 |
| Hon. Robert Ponsonby Tottenham. Trans. to Ferns, 1820; Clogher, 1822 ... ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | St. Peter's, Dublin ... | 16th December, 1804 |
| Lord John George Beresford. Trans. to Raphoe, 1807; Clogher, 1819; Dublin, 1819; Armagh, 1822 | Cork, &c. ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 24th March, 1805 |
| John Kearney ... ... | Ossory ... ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 2nd February, 1806 |
| Charles Mongan Warburton ... | Limerick, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 13th July, 1806 |
| Hon. Thomas St. Lawrence ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | ,, ... | 27th September, 1807 |
| Hon. Percy Jocelyn. Trans. to Clogher, 1820 ... ... | Ferns, &c. ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 3rd September, 1809 |
| James Verschoyle ... ... | Killala, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 6th May, 1810 |
| George Hall ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 17th November, 1811 |
| John Leslie. Trans to Elphin, 1819; Kilmore and Elphin, 1841 | Dromore ... ... | Armagh Cathedral ... | 26th January, 1812 |
| Robert Fowler, Bishop of Ossory and Ferns, 1835 ... ... | Ossory ... ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 20th June, 1813 |
| Hon. Richard Bourke ... ... | Waterford, &c. ... | Cashel Cathedral ... | 10th October, 1813 |
| William Magee. Trans. to Dublin, 1822 ... ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 19th September, 1819 |
| James Saurin ... ... ... | Dromore ... ... | Armagh Cathedral ... | 19th December, 1819 |
| Richard Mant. Trans. to Down, 1823; Bishop of Down and Dromore, 1841 ... ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | Cashel Cathedral ... | 30th April, 1820 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Thomas Elrington. Trans. to Ferns, 1822 ... ... ... | Limerick, &c. ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 8th October, 1820 |
| Richard Laurence ... ... | Cashel ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 21st July, 1822 |
| William Bissett ... ... | Raphoe ... ... | ,, ... | ,, |
| John Jebb ... ... ... | Limerick, &c. ... | Cashel Cathedral ... | 12th January, 1823 |
| Alexander Arbuthnot ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | Tuam Cathedral ... | 11th May, 1823 |
| John Brinkley ... ... ... | Cloyne ... ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 8th October, 1826 |
| Hon Richard Ponsonby. Trans. to Derry, 1831; Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, 1834 ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 16th March, 1828 |
| Samuel Kyle, Bishop of Cork and Cloyne, 1835 ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 27th March, 1831 |
| Hon. Edmund Knox. Trans. to Limerick, 1834 ... ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | Castle Chapel, Dublin ... | 9th October, 1831 |
| Richard Whately ... ... | Dublin ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 23rd October, 1831 |
| Stephen Creagh Sandes. Trans. to Cashel and Waterford, 1839 ... | Killaloe and Clonfert | Trinity College Chapel ... | 12th June, 1836 |
| Hon. Ludlow Tonson ... ... | Killaloe and Clonfert | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 17th February, 1839 |
| Hon. Thomas Plunket ... ... | Tuam and Killala ... | ,, ... | 14th April, 1839 |
| Charles Dickinson ... ... | Meath ... ... | ,, ... | 27th December, 1840 |
| James Thomas O'Brien ... | Ossory and Ferns ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 20th March, 1842 |
| Edward Stopford ... ... | Meath ... ... | Armagh Cathedral ... | 6th November, 1842 |
| Robert Daly ... ... ... | Cashel and Waterford | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 29th January, 1843 |
| James Wilson ... ... ... | Cork and Cloyne ... | ,, ... | 30th July, 1848 |
| Robert Knox ... ... ... | Down and Dromore ... | Armagh Cathedral ... | 1st May, 1849 |

| NAME OF BISHOP. | NAME OF SEE. | PLACE OF CONSECRATION. | DATE. |
|---|---|---|---|
| William Higgin. Trans. to Derry and Raphoe, 1853 ... ... | Limerick ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 15th July, 1849 |
| Hon. Thomas Stuart Townsend ... | Meath ... ... | Armagh Cathedral ... | 1st November, 1850 |
| James Henderson Singer ... | Meath ... ... | Trinity College Chapel ... | 28th November, 1852 |
| Henry Griffin ... ... ... | Limerick ... ... | ,, ... | 1st January, 1854 |
| Marcus Gervais Beresford. Trans. to Armagh, 1862 ... ... | Kilmore and Elphin ... | Armagh Cathedral ... | 24th September, 1854 |
| William Fitzgerald. Trans to Killaloe, 1862 ... ... ... | Cork, &c. ... ... | ... | 1857 |
| John Gregg ... ... ... | Cork ... ... | ... | 1862 |
| Richard Chenevix Trench ... | Dublin ... ... | ... | 1st January, 1864 |
| Samuel Butcher ... ... | Meath ... ... | ... | 1866 |
| Charles Graves ... ... | Limerick ... ... | ... | 1866 |
| Hon. Charles Brodrick Bernard ... | Tuam ... ... | ... | January, 1867 |
| William Alexander ... ... | Derry and Raphoe ... | ... | 6th October, 1867 |
| Hamilton Verschoyle ... ... | Kilmore, &c. ... | Kilmore Cathedral ... | 1862 |
| Maurice Fitzgerald Day ... | Cashel, &c. ... | ... | 1872 |
| John R. Darley ... .. | Kilmore, &c. ... | | 25th October, 1874 |
| Robert Samuel Gregg. Trans. to Cork. 1878 ... ... ... | Ossory, &c. ... | ... | March, 1875 |
| Right Hon. Wm. Conyngham, Lord Plunket. Trans. to Dublin, 1885 | Meath ... ... | ... | 10th December, 1876 |
| William Pakenham Walsh ... | Ossory, &c. ... | ... | September, 1878 |
| William Bennett Chester ... | Killaloe, &c. ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 24th February. 1884 |
| Samuel Shone ... ... ... | Kilmore, &c. ... | Christ Church, Dublin ... | 25th April, 1884 |
| Charles Parsons Reichel ... | Meath ... ... | St. Patrick's, Dublin ... | 29th September, 1885 |

# WORKS BY REV. HENRY SEDDALL, LL.D.

*8vo cloth. Price, 12s.*

## MALTA: PAST AND PRESENT.

"A valuable addition to English Literature."—*Malta Observer.*

"The author deserves great credit for his industry and research, and his work is a solid and useful compilation."—*Echo.*

"The writer of it is clear-sighted and honest."—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

"The author proves himself admirably qualified as a historian."—*Evening Mail.*

"It supplies a vein of historical information which is by no means readily accessible in other works."—*Tablet.*

N.B.—The first edition of "Malta: Past and Present," published in 1870, is out of print. A second edition is ready for the press, and will be issued if called for by those interested in the subject.

## THE MISSIONARY HISTORY OF SIERRA LEONE.

*Price 3s. 6d.*

"An interesting narrative of the Colony and the Slave Trade."—*Echo.*

"A very full and most satisfactory account of Missionary Work." *Standard.*

"The author has told the story of the Mission sympathisingly and well."—*Literary Churchman.*

"A most comprehensive history of the work of the Church Missionary Society."—*Our Own Fireside.*

"An admirable example of what may be done in the way of weaving the story of Christian enterprise into the history of our innumerable colonies."—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

"The story has a charm beyond that of novelty."—*Christian Observer.*

"The work is altogether admirable, and should be read by all who are interested in missionary work."—*Daily Express.*

"Ably written, and full of important statements."—*Rock.*

"It is a useful summary of what the Church Missionary Society has done."—*Literary World.*

"This history brings together a large mass of valuable and interesting information."—*Christian Advocate.*

---

## EDWARD NANGLE:

### The Apostle of Achill; a Memoir and a History.

*Price 6s. Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.*

"We cordially congratulate Dr. Seddall on his entire success in bringing out this book. The book is a thrilling Biography. . . . . As a study of human life and conduct, it will interest all readers."—*Dublin Evening Mail.*

"The materials are well arranged, the style is agreeable, and the interest well sustained throughout."—*Daily Express.*

"This is a book of peculiar interest. The Bishop of Meath's admirable Introduction has an especial value touching the Church of Ireland as being a missionary Church."—*The Churchman.*

"A more romantic and wonderful history is not furnished from any foreign field of missionary labour."—*New York Observer.*

"This deeply interesting volume does justice to the self-denying labours of a devoted Irish missionary."—*Cork Constitution.*

"Dr Seddall has done his work as a biographer sympathetically and well."—*Literary Churchman.*

---

SOLD BY

HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO., 104 GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

# HODGES, FIGGIS, & CO.'S

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*Second Series, Crown 8vo, price 6s.*

SERMONS PREACHED IN TRINITY CHURCH, DUBLIN. By the late JOHN GREGG, D.D., Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross.

"There is a noble realism, and an unquestionable inspiration in these Discourses that cannot fail to reach many hearts."—*Presbyterian Churchman.*

"For breadth of power, originality of illustration, and richness of imagery, his Sermons were unequalled."—*Belfast News-Letter.*

---

*Crown 8vo, Cloth elegant, price 3s. 6d.*

DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE; a Memorial Calendar. Compiled by A. L. W.

The object of this little Book, as stated in the Preface, is to record the death-days of our departed friends and eminent personages, and to derive thoughts of hope and comfort, in seasons of sorrow, from the promises of Holy Scripture. The Compiler earnestly hopes that it may prove acceptable in many households.

---

*Crown 8vo, Cloth, price 2s. 6d.*

ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY, and other University Sermons. By CHARLES PARSONS REICHEL, D.D., Bishop of Meath.

---

*Crown 8vo, price 5s.*

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP ON CHURCH PRINCIPLES: An Essay on the Gifts and Functions of the Christian Society. By RICHARD TRAVERS SMITH, B.D.

---

*Second Edition, fcap. 8vo, price One Shilling.*

THE BIBLE STUDENT'S EXAMINATION GUIDE to the Study of Scripture. By J. J. CARLILE BREAKEY, B.A.

---

9522 - 2



*Third Edition, post 8vo, 5s.*

THE EFFICACY OF PRAYER. By JOHN H. JELLETT, D.D., Provost of Trinity College.

*Fifth Edition, post 8vo, price 7s. 6d.*

THE NATURE AND EFFECTS OF FAITH. By the late JAMES THOMAS O'BRIEN, D.D., Bishop of Ossory (preparing).

*Fifth Edition, 8vo, Cloth, price 12s. 6d.*

THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE: its Nature and Proof. By the late Ven. WILLIAM LEE, D.D., Archdeacon of Dublin.

*8vo, Cloth (nearly ready).*

UNIVERSITY SERMONS. By WILLIAM LEE, D.D.

*Second Edition, Crown 8vo, 3s.*

THE STOIC MORALISTS AND THE CHRISTIANS. By THOMAS JORDAN, D.D.

*Crown 8vo, 3s.*

CHRISTIAN VITALITY; or, the Recuperative Power of the Christian System. By J. W. MURRAY, LL.D., Archdeacon of Connor.

*Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.*

THE EPISTLES AND HYMNS OF ST. PATRICK. With the Poem of Secundinus. Translated by THOMAS OLDEN, B.A., M.R.I.A.

*Second Edition, fcap., 1s. 6d.*

CATECHETICAL EPITOME OF BUTLER'S ANALOGY of Religion.

*New Edition, 12mo, 3s.*

ARCHBISHOP SECKER'S LECTURES ON THE CREED.

104 GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

CHARLES W. GIBBS, Printer, Dublin.